# THE AMERICAN CATHOLIC

# QUARTERLY REVIEW

"Contributors to the QUARTERLY will be allowed all proper freedom in the expression of their thoughts outside the domain of defined doctrines, the REVIEW not holding itself responsible for the individual opinions of its contributors."

(Extract from Salutatory, July, 1890.)

VOL. XXXI.—APRIL, 1906—No. 122.


## ENCYCLICAL LETTER OF OUR HOLY FATHER POPE PIUS X.

To the Archbishops, Bishops, Clergy and People of France.
To Our Well-Beloved Sons,

Francois Marie Richard, Cardinal Priest of Holy Roman Church, Archbishop of Paris; Victor Lucien Lecot, Cardinal Priest of Holy Roman Church, Archbishop of Bordeaux; Pierre Hector Coullie, Cardinal Priest of Holy Roman Church, Archbishop of Lyons; Joseph Guillaume Labourе, Cardinal Priest of Holy Roman Church, Archbishop of Rennes, and to all Our Venerable Brethren, the Archbishops and Bishops and to all the Clergy and People of France.

PIUS X., POPE.

*Venerable Brethren, Well-Beloved Sons, Health and Apostolic Benediction.*

OUR soul is full of sorrowful solicitude and our heart overflows with grief when our thoughts dwell upon you. How, indeed, could it be otherwise, immediately after the promulgation of that law which, by sundering violently the old ties that linked your nation with the Apostolic See, creates for the Catholic Church in France a situation unworthy of her and ever to be lamented?


Entered according to Act of Congress, in the year 1906, by P. J. Ryan, in the Office of the Librarian of Congress, at Washington, D. C.

That is, beyond question, an event of the gravest import, and one that must be deplored by all right-minded men, for it is as disastrous to society as it is to religion; but it is an event which can have surprised nobody who has paid any attention to the religious policy followed in France of late years. For you, Venerable Brethren, it will certainly have been nothing new or strange, witnesses as you have been of the many dreadful blows aimed from time to time at religion by the public authority. You have seen the sanctity and the inviolability of Christian marriage outraged by legislative acts in formal contradiction with them; the schools and hospitals laicised; clerics torn from their studies and from ecclesiastical discipline to be subjected to military service; the religious congregations dispersed and despoiled, and their members for the most part reduced to the last stage of destitution. Other legal measures which you all know have followed—the law ordaining public prayers at the beginning of each Parliamentary session and of the assizes has been abolished; the signs of mourning traditionally observed on board the ships on Good Friday suppressed; the religious character effaced from the judicial oath; all actions and emblems serving in any way to recall the idea of religion banished from the courts, the schools, the army, the navy, and, in a word, from all public establishments. These measures and others still which, one after another, really separated the Church from the State, were but so many steps designedly made to arrive at complete and official separation, as the authors of them have publicly and frequently admitted.

On the other hand, the Holy See has spared absolutely no means to avert this great calamity. While it was untiring in warning those who were at the head of affairs in France, and in conjuring them over and over again to weigh well the immensity of the evils that would infallibly result from their separatist policy, it at the same time lavished upon France the most striking proofs of indulgent affection. It had then reason to hope that gratitude would have stayed those politicians on their downward path, and brought them at last to relinquish their designs. But all has been in vain—the attentions, good offices and efforts of our predecessor and ourself. The enemies of religion have succeeded at last in effecting by violence what they have long desired, in defiance of your rights as a Catholic nation and of the wishes of all who think rightly. At a moment of such gravity for the Church, therefore, filled with the sense of our Apostolic responsibility, we have considered it our duty to raise our voice and to open our heart to you, Venerable Brethren, and to your clergy and people—to all of you whom we have ever cherished with special affection, but whom we now, as is only right, love more tenderly than ever.

That the State must be separated from the Church is a thesis absolutely false, a most pernicious error. Based, as it is, on the principle that the State must not recognize any religious cult, it is in the first place guilty of a great injustice to God; for the Creator of man is also the Founder of human societies, and preserves their existence as He preserves our own. We owe Him, therefore, not only a private cult, but a public and social worship to honor Him. Besides, it is an obvious negation of the supernatural order. It limits the action of the State to the pursuit of public prosperity during this life only, which is but the proximate object of political societies; and it occupies itself in no fashion (on the plea that this is foreign to it) with their ultimate object, which is man's eternal happiness after this short life shall have run its course. But as the present order of things is temporary and subordinated to the attainment of man's supreme and absolute welfare, it follows that the civil power must not only place no obstacle in the way of this object, but must aid us in affecting it. It also upsets the order providentially established by God in the world, which demands a harmonious agreement between the two societies, the civil and the religious, although each exercises its authority in its own sphere. It follows necessarily that there are many things belonging to them in common in which both societies must have relations with one another. Remove the agreement between Church and State, and the result will be that from these common matters will spring the seeds of disputes which will become acute on both sides; it will become more difficult to see where the truth lies, and great confusion is certain to arise. Finally, it inflicts great injury on society itself, for it cannot either prosper or last long when due place is not left for religion, which is the supreme rule and the sovereign mistress in all questions touching the rights and the duties of men. Hence the Roman Pontiffs have never ceased, as circumstances required, to refute and condemn the doctrine of the separation of Church and State. Our illustrious predecessor, Leo XIII., especially, has frequently and splendidly expounded Catholic teaching on the relations which should subsist between the two societies. "Between them," he says, "there must necessarily be a suitable union, which may not improperly be compared with that existing between body and soul.—*Quaedam intercedat necesse est ordinata colligatio (inter illas) quae quidem conjunctio non immerito comparatur, per quam anima et corpus in homine corpulantur.*" He proceeds: "Human societies cannot, without becoming criminal, act as if God did not exist or refuse to concern themselves with religion, as though it were something foreign to them, or of no purpose to them. . . . As for the Church, which has God Himself for its author, to exclude her

from the active life of the nation, from the laws, the education of the young, the family, is a great and pernicious error.—*Civitates non possunt citra scelus, gerere se tamquam si Deus omnino non esset, aut curam religionis velut alienam nihilque profuturam abjicere. . . . Ecclesiam vero, quam Deus ipse constituit, ab actione vitae excludere, a legibus, ab institutione adolescentium, a societate domestica, magnus et perniciosus est error.*"[1]

And if it is true that any Christian State does something which is eminently disastrous and reprehensible in separating itself from the Church, how much more deplorable is it that France, of all nations in the world, should have entered on this policy; France, which has been during the course of centuries the object of such great and special predilection on the part of the Apostolic See, whose fortunes and glories have ever been closely bound up with the practice of Christian virtue and respect for religion. Leo XIII. had truly good reason to say: "France cannot forget that Providence has united its destiny with the Holy See by ties too strong and too old that she should ever wish to break them. And it is this union that has been the source of her real greatness and her purest glories. . . . To disturb this traditional union would be to deprive the nation of part of her moral force and her great influence in the world."[2]

And the ties that consecrated this union should have been doubly inviolable from the fact that they were sanctioned by oath-bound treaties. The Concordat entered upon by the Sovereign Pontiff and the French Government was, like all treaties of the same kind, concluded between States, a bilateral contract binding on both parties to it. The Roman Pontiff on the one side and the head of the French nation on the other solemnly stipulated both for themselves and their successors to maintain inviolate the pact they signed. Hence the same rule applied to the Concordat as to all international treaties, viz., the law of nations, which prescribes that it could not be in any way annulled by one alone of the contracting parties. The Holy See has always observed with scrupulous fidelity the engagements it has made, and it has always required the same fidelity from the State. This is a truth which no impartial judge can deny. Yet to-day the State, by its sole authority, abrogates the solemn pact it signed. Thus it violates its sworn promise. To break with the Church, to free itself from her friendship, it has stopped at nothing, and has not hesitated to outrage the Apostolic See by this violation of the law of nations, and to disturb the social and political order itself—for the reciprocal security of nations in their relations with

[1] Ency. "Immortale Dei," Nov., 1885.

[2] Allocution to the French pilgrims, April 13, 1888.

one another depends mainly on the inviolable fidelity and the sacred respect with which they observe their treaties.

The extent of the injury inflicted on the Apostolic See by the unilateral abrogation of the Concordat is notably aggravated by the manner in which the State has effected this abrogation. It is a principle admitted without controversy, and universally observed by all nations, that the breaking of a treaty should be previously and regularly notified in a clear and explicit manner, to the other contracting party by the one which intends to put an end to the treaty. Yet not only has no notification of this kind been made to the Holy See, but no indication whatever on the subject has been conveyed to it. Thus the French Government has not hesitated to treat the Apostolic See without ordinary respect and without the courtesy that is never omitted even in dealing with the smallest States. Its officials, representatives though they were of a Catholic nation, have heaped contempt on the dignity and power of the Sovereign Pontiff, the Supreme Head of the Church, whereas they should have shown more respect to this power than to any other political power—and a respect all the greater from the fact that the Holy See is concerned with the eternal welfare of souls, and that its mission extends everywhere.

If we now proceed to examine in itself the law that has just been promulgated, we find therein fresh reason for protesting still more energetically. When the State broke the bonds of the Concordat and separated itself from the Church it ought, as a natural consequence, to have left her her independence and allowed her to enjoy peacefully that liberty granted by the common law which it pretended to assign to her. Nothing of the kind has been done. We recognize in the law many exceptional and odiously restrictive provisions, the effect of which is to place the Church under the domination of the civil power. It has been a source of bitter grief to us to see the State thus encroach on matters which are within the exclusive jurisdiction of the Church; and we bewail this all the more for the reason that the State, dead to all sense of equity and justice, has thereby created for the Church of France a situation grievous, crushing and oppressive of her most sacred rights.

For the provisions of the new law are contrary to the constitution on which the Church was founded by Jesus Christ. The Scripture teaches us, and the tradition of the Fathers confirms the teaching, that the Church is the mystical body of Christ, ruled by the *Pastors* and *Doctors* (Ephes. iv., 11 sqq.)—a society of men containing within its own fold chiefs who have full and perfect powers for ruling, teaching and judging (Matt. xxviii., 18-20; xvi., 18, 19; xviii., 17; Tit. ii., 15; II. Cor. x., 6; xiii., 10, etc.) It follows that

the Church is essentially an *unequal* society, that is, a society comprising two categories of persons, the pastors and the flock, those who occupy a rank in the different degrees of the hierarchy and the multitude of the faithful. So distinct are these categories that with the pastoral body only rests the necessary right and authority for promoting the end of that society and directing all its members towards its end; the one duty of the multitude is to allow themselves to be led, and, like a docile flock, to follow the pastors. St. Cyprian, Martyr, expresses this truth admirably when he writes: "Our Lord, whose precepts we must revere and observe, in establishing the episcopal dignity and the nature of the Church, addresses Peter thus in the Gospel: *Ego dico tibi, quia tu es Petrus, etc.* Hence through all the vicissitudes of time and circumstance the plan of the episcopate and the constitution of the Church have always been found to be so framed that the Church rests on the Bishops, and that all its acts are ruled by them.—*Dominus Noster, cujus praecepta metuere et servare debemus, episcopi honorem et ecclesiae suae rationem disponens, in evangelio loquitur et dicit Petro: Ego dico tibi quia tu es Petrus, etc. . . . Inde per temporum et successionum vices Episcoporum ordinatio et Ecclesiae ratio decurrit, ut Ecclesia super Episcopos constituatur et omnis actus Ecclesiae per eosdem praepositos gubernetur*" (St. Cyprian, Epist. xxvii.-xxviii. ad Lapsos ii. i.). St. Cyprian affirms that all this is based on divine law, *divina lege fundatum.* The Law of Separation, in opposition to these principles, assigns the administration and the supervision of public worship not to the hierarchical body divinely instituted by Our Saviour, but to an association formed of laymen. To this association it assigns a special form and a juridical personality, and considers it alone as having rights and responsibilities in the eyes of the law in all matters appertaining to religious worship. It is this association which is to have the use of the churches and sacred edifices, which is to possess ecclesiastical property, real and personal, which is to have at its disposition (though only for a time) the residences of the Bishops and priests and the seminaries; which is to administer the property, regulate collections and receive the alms and the legacies destined for religious worship. As for the hierarchical body of pastors, the law is completely silent. And if it does prescribe that the associations of worship are to be constituted in harmony with the general rules of organization of the cult whose existence they are designed to assure, it is none the less true that care has been taken to declare that in all disputes which may arise relative to their property, the Council of State is the only competent tribunal. These associations of worship are therefore placed in such a state of dependence on the civil authority that the

ecclesiastical authority will, clearly, have no power over them. It is obvious at a glance that all these provisions seriously violate the rights of the Church and are in opposition with her divine constitution. Moreover, the law on these points is not set forth in clear and precise terms, but is left so vague and so open to arbitrary decisions that its mere interpretation is well calculated to be productive of the greatest trouble.

Besides, nothing more hostile to the liberty of the Church than this law could well be conceived. For, with the existence of the association of worship, the Law of Separation hinders the pastors from exercising the plenitude of their authority and of their office over the faithful, when it attributes to the Council of State supreme jurisdiction over these associations and submits them to a whole series of prescriptions not contained in common law, rendering their formation difficult and their continued existence more difficult still; when, after proclaiming the liberty of public worship, it proceeds to restrict its exercise by numerous exceptions; when it despoils the Church of the internal regulation of the churches in order to invest the State with this function; when it thwarts the preaching of Catholic faith and morals and sets up a severe and exceptional penal code for clerics—when it sanctions all these provisions and many others of the same kind in which wide scope is left to arbitrary ruling, does it not place the Church in a position of humiliating subjection and, under the pretext of protecting public order, deprive peaceable citizens, who still constitute the vast majority in France, of the sacred right of practising their religion? Hence it is not merely by restricting the exercise of worship (to which the Law of Separation falsely reduces the essence of religion) that the State injures the Church, but by putting obstacles to her influence, always a beneficent influence over the people, and by paralyzing her activity in a thousand different ways. Thus, for instance, the State has not been satisfied with depriving the Church of the religious orders, those precious auxiliaries of hers in her sacred mission, in teaching and education, in charitable works, but it must also deprive her of the resources which constitute the human means necessary for her existence and the accomplishment of her mission.

In addition to the wrongs and injuries to which we have so far referred, the Law of Separation also violates and tramples under foot the rights of property of the Church. In defiance of all justice, it despoils the Church of a great portion of a patrimony which belongs to her by titles as numerous as they are sacred; it suppresses and annuls all the pious foundations consecrated, with perfect legality, to divine worship and to suffrages for the dead. The resources furnished by Catholic liberality for the maintenance of

Catholic schools, and the working of various charitable associations connected with religion, have been transferred to lay associations in which it would be idle to seek for a vestige of religion. In this it violates not only the rights of the Church, but the formal and explicit purpose of the donors and testators. It is also a subject of keen grief to us that the law, in contempt of all right, proclaims as property of the State, departments or communes the ecclesiastical edifices dating from before the Concordat. True, the law concedes the gratuitous use of them, for an indefinite period, to the associations of worship, but it surrounds the concession with so many and so serious reserves that in reality it leaves to the public powers the full disposition of them. Moreover, we entertain the gravest fears for the sanctity of those temples, the august refuges of the Divine Majesty and endeared by a thousand memories to the piety of the French people. For they are certainly in danger of profanation if they fall into the hands of laymen.

When the law, by the suppression of the Budget of Public Worship, exonerates the State from the obligation of providing for the expenses of worship, it violates an engagement contracted in a diplomatic convention, and at the same time commits a great injustice. On this point there cannot be the slightest doubt, for the documents of history offer the clearest confirmation of it. When the French Government assumed in the Concordat the obligation of supplying the clergy with a revenue sufficient for their decent subsistence and for the requirements of public worship, the concession was not a merely gratuitous one—it was an obligation assumed by the State to make restitution, at least in part, to the Church whose property had been confiscated during the first Revolution. On the other hand, when the Roman Pontiff in this same Concordat bound himself and his successors, for the sake of peace, not to disturb the possessors of property thus taken from the Church, he did so only on one condition: that the French Government should bind itself in perpetuity to endow the clergy suitably and to provide for the expenses of divine worship.

Finally, there is another point on which we cannot be silent. Besides the injury it inflicts on the interests of the Church, the new law is destined to be most disastrous to your country. For there can be no doubt but that it lamentably destroys union and concord. And yet without such union and concord no nation can live long or prosper. Especially in the present state of Europe, the maintenance of perfect harmony must be the most ardent wish of everybody in France who loves his country and has its salvation at heart. As for us, following the example of our predecessor and inheriting from him a special predilection for your nation, we have not confined

ourself to striving for the preservation of all the rights of the religion of your forefathers, but we have always, with that fraternal peace of which religion is certainly the strongest bond ever before our eyes, endeavored to promote unity among you. We cannot, therefore, without the keenest sorrow observe that the French Government has just done a deed which inflames on religious grounds passions already too dangerously excited, and which, therefore, seems to be calculated to plunge the whole country into disorder.

Hence, mindful of our Apostolic charge and conscious of the imperious duty incumbent upon us of defending and preserving against all assaults the full and absolute integrity of the sacred and inviolable rights of the Church, we do, by virtue of the supreme authority which God has confided to us, and on the grounds above set forth, reprove and condemn the law voted in France for the separation of Church and State as deeply unjust to God, whom it denies, and as laying down the principle that the Republic recognizes no cult. We reprove and condemn it as violating the natural law, the law of nations, and fidelity to treaties; as contrary to the Divine constitution of the Church, to her essential rights and to her liberty; as destroying justice and trampling under foot the rights of property which the Church has acquired by many titles and, in addition, by virtue of the Concordat. We reprove and condemn it as gravely offensive to the dignity of this Apostolic See, to our own person, to the Episcopacy and to the clergy and all the Catholics of France. Therefore, we protest solemnly and with all our strength against the introduction, the voting and the promulgation of this law, declaring that it can never be alleged against the imprescriptible rights of the Church.

We had to address these grave words to you, Venerable Brethren, to the people of France and of the whole Christian world, in order to make known in its true light what has been done. Deep indeed is our distress when we look into the future and see there the evils that this law is about to bring upon a people so tenderly loved by us. And we are still more grievously affected by the thought of the trials, sufferings and tribulations of all kinds that are to be visited on you, Venerable Brethren, and on all your clergy. Yet, in the midst of these crushing cares, we are saved from excessive affliction and discouragement when our mind turns to Divine Providence, so rich in mercies, and to the hope, a thousand times verified, that Jesus Christ will not abandon His Church or ever deprive her of His unfailing support. We are, then, far from feeling any fear for the Church. Her strength and her stability are divine, as the experience of ages triumphantly proves. The world knows of the endless calamities, each more terrible than the last, that have fallen upon her during

this long course of time—but where all purely human institutions must inevitably have succumbed, the Church has drawn from her trials only fresh strength and richer fruitfulness. As to the persecuting laws passed against her, history teaches, even in recent times, and France itself confirms the lesson, that though forged by hatred, they are always at last wisely abrogated, when they are found to be prejudicial to the interests of the State. God grant that those who are at present in power in France may soon follow the example set for them in this matter by their predecessors. God grant that they may, amid the applause of all good people, make haste to restore to religion, the source of civilization and prosperity, the honor which is due to her, together with her liberty.

Meanwhile, and as long as oppressive persecution continues, the children of the Church, *putting on the armor of light,* must act with all their strength in defense of Truth and Justice—it is their duty always, and to-day more than ever. To this holy contest you, Venerable Brethren, who are to be the teachers and guides, will bring all the force of that vigilant and indefatigable zeal of which the French Episcopate has, to its honor, given so many well-known proofs. But above all things we wish, for it is of the greatest importance, that in all the plans you undertake for the defense of the Church, you endeavor to ensure the most perfect union of hearts and wills. It is our firm intention to give you at a fitting time practical instructions which shall serve as a sure rule of conduct for you amid the great difficulties of the present time. And we are certain in advance that you will faithfully adopt them. Meanwhile continue the salutary work you are doing; strive to kindle piety among the people as much as possible; promote and popularize more and more the teaching of Christian doctrine; preserve the souls entrusted to you from errors and seductions they meet on all sides; instruct, warn, encourage, console your flocks, and perform for them all the duties imposed on you by your pastoral office. In this work you will certainly find indefatigable collaborators in your clergy. It is rich in men remarkable for piety, knowledge and devotion to the Holy See, and we know that they are always ready to devote themselves unreservedly under your direction to the cause of the triumph of the Church and the eternal salvation of souls. The clergy will also certainly understand that during the present turmoil they must be animated by the sentiments professed long ago by the Apostles, rejoicing that they are found worthy to suffer opprobrium for the name of Jesus, *"Gaudentes quoniam digni habiti sunt pro nomine Jesu contumeliam pati"* (Rom. xiii., 12). They will therefore stoutly stand up for the rights and liberty of the Church, but without offense to anybody. Nay, more, in their earnestness to preserve charity,

as the ministers of Jesus Christ are especially bound to do, they will reply to iniquity with justice, to outrage with mildness, and to ill-treatment with benefits.

And now we turn to you, Catholics of France, asking you to receive our words as a testimony of that most tender affection with which we have never ceased to love your country, and as comfort to you in the midst of the terrible calamities through which you will have to pass. You know the aim of the impious sects which are placing your heads under their yoke, for they themselves have proclaimed with cynical boldness that they are determined to "de-Catholicize" France. They want to root out from your hearts the last vestige of the faith which covered your fathers with glory, which made your country great and prosperous among nations, which sustains you in your trials, which brings tranquillity and peace to your homes, and which opens to you the way to eternal happiness. You feel that you must defend this faith with your whole souls. But be not deluded—all labor and effort will be useless if you endeavor to repulse the assaults made on you without being firmly united. Remove, therefore, any causes of disunion that may exist among you. And do what is necessary to ensure that your unity may be as strong as it should be among men who are fighting for the same cause, especially when this cause is of those for the triumph of which everybody should be willing to sacrifice something of his own opinions. If you wish, within the limits of your strength and according to your imperious duty, to save the religion of your ancestors from the dangers to which it is exposed, it is of the first importance that you show a large degree of courage and generosity. We feel sure that you will show this generosity, and by being charitable towards God's ministers, you will incline God to be more and more charitable towards yourselves.

As for the defense of religion, if you wish to undertake it in a worthy manner, and to carry it on perseveringly and efficaciously, two things are first of all necessary: you must model yourselves so faithfully on the precepts of the Christian law that all your actions and your entire lives may do honor to the faith you profess, and then you must be closely united with those whose special office it is to watch over religion, with your priests, your Bishops, and above all with this Apostolic See, which is the pivot of the Catholic faith and of all that can be done in its name. Thus armed for the fray, go forth fearlessly for the defense of the Church; but take care that your trust is placed entirely in God, for whose cause you are working, and never cease to pray to Him for help.

For us, as long as you have to struggle against danger, we will be heart and soul in the midst of you; your labors, pains, sufferings—

we will share them all with you; and pouring forth to God, who has founded the Church and ever preserves her, our most humble and instant prayers, we will implore Him to bend a look of mercy on France, to save her from the storms that have been let loose upon her, and, by the intercession of Mary Immaculate, to restore soon to her the blessings of calm and peace.

As a pledge of these heavenly gifts and a proof of our special predilection, we impart with all our heart the Apostolic Benediction to you, Venerable Brethren, to your clergy and to the entire French people.

Given at Rome, at St. Peter's, on February 11, in the year 1906, the third of our Pontificate.

PIUS X., POPE.

## PIUS VI. AND THE FRENCH REVOLUTION.

IT IS said that the present Sovereign Pontiff on the day of his election to the Chair of Saint Peter gave as his reason for choosing the name of Pius that it had been borne by the Popes who had defended the Church and the Holy See against the Revolution from its beginning, and that as he, too, was in presence of the same enemy, he had adopted a name which recalled their courageous resistance. The Revolution, indeed, still carries on its warfare against the Church, more especially on the Continent of Europe, and though the Radicals and Socialists of the present day have laid aside the sanguinary methods employed by their forerunners, the Jacobins of the end of the eighteenth century, they are animated by a spirit no less hostile to Christianity than that which abolished every manifestation of religion in France and deluged the land with blood. Their fanaticism was, however, but the inevitable result of the infidelity which had been so actively propagated in the early part of the same century by Voltaire and his followers who formed that school of atheistical writers known as *"les Philosophes"* from their pretension to be guided solely by the light of reason, or as *"les Encyclopedistes,"* from the voluminous work which they compiled for the purpose of disseminating their doctrines. The preparatory steps in this campaign, which was undertaken for the express purpose of eradicating Christianity, consisted in seeking to subject the Church to the civil power as much as possible; in severing, or at least hindering the relations of the Bishops with Rome, and in depriving them of the assistance afforded them by the religious orders,

above all others of that order which had fought most strenuously against the teaching of Voltaire, which had shown itself the most zealous in sustaining the authority of the Holy See, and whose destruction, it was clearly foreseen, would bring about that of all the rest—the Society of Jesus.

A plan for effecting the abolition of the religious orders slowly and gradually, so as not to excite too much alarm among the public, by secularizing at first only the smaller communities, and by raising the age for the reception of novices, was drawn up about 1745 by the Marquis d'Argenson (1694-1757), Minister for Foreign Affairs under Louis XV., a friend and a protector of Voltaire, and for over forty years the French Government continued to be guided by it in its dealings with the Church.[1] The suppression of the Jesuits was more especially the work of the Marquis de Pompadour and of the Duke de Choiseul, who, of all the ministers of Louis XV., was the one on whose assistance Voltaire most relied, and he is reported to have said while conversing with some foreign envoys that if he had the power he would destroy the Jesuits alone, as then all the other religious organizations would fall of themselves.[2] Frederic II. of Prussia also saw the necessity of suppressing the religious orders before attacking the hierarchy, and in a letter to Voltaire of March 24, 1767, he states that he had remarked that in those places where there were most monastic houses the people were most attached to religion, and that there could be no doubt but that their destruction would render the people lukewarm and indifferent. He then dissuades Voltaire from attacking the Bishops first, as it was not as yet time to do so, but that when the religious feeling of the people should have cooled down the Bishops would be like little children and the sovereigns could then treat them as they thought fit. The same idea reappears in the King's letter of August 13, 1775, where, alluding to the Catholic Church, he reminds his impatient correspondent that the edifice must be undermined secretly and noiselessly so as to make it fall to pieces of itself.[3]

In this warfare against the Jesuits and the other religious orders the "Philosophers" were powerfully aided by the lawyers who composed the various Parliaments of France, which though originally only High Courts of Justice, had gradually usurped the powers of the *"Etats Généraux"* (or States General), which the Kings had ceased to convoke since more than a century. In the earlier times of the French monarchy it had been the custom for these tribunals to register the edicts issued by the sovereign, giving them thereby

[1] L'Abbé Barruel, "Mémoires pour servir à l'Histoire du Jacobinisme," 1797, Part I., p. 84.

[2] *Ibid*, p. 88.

[3] Quoted by Barruel, pp. 113 and 117.

publicity and legal force. They had also the right of expressing their opinions and presenting their remonstrances against measures which they considered unjust. Little by little they laid claim to exercise greater control over the acts of the Crown and to make their will be felt in political questions, and though these tendencies had been repressed under the rule of Cardinal de Richelieu and later under that of Louis XIV., the Parliaments regained their ascendancy under the regency of the Duke of Orléans (1715-1722), and their unceasing conflicts with the government during the reigns of Louis XV. and Louis XVI. had no small share in preparing the way for the Revolution.[4]

A large number of the presidents and councillors of these courts were Jansenists, sectarians masquerading as Catholics, and who, though professing great austerity of life and affecting much outward piety, were vehemently opposed to the authority of the Holy See, and were therefore the most bitter and unscrupulous enemies of the Jesuits. Under their influence the Parliament of Paris, followed by most of the provincial Parliaments, exceeding the limits of its jurisdiction, claimed the right to interfere in the discipline of the Church; it dispensed from their vows rebellious members of religious orders;[5] it commanded the parish priests to administer the sacraments to unrepentant Jansenists on their deathbed; it forbade to teach the supremacy of the Pope in the universities and seminaries; in 1730 it suppressed the office and the feast of St. Gregory VII., and in 1737 it refused to allow the publication of the Bull by which Clement XII. announced the canonization of St. Vincent de Paul.[6] Such was the tribunal which expelled the Jesuits from France without the formality of a trial.

The series of aggressions of which the Jesuits had been for many years the object in the Parliament of Paris were brought to a climax by a decree of July 18, 1761, ordering the college of the fathers in Paris to be closed. Its execution was, however, suspended by an edict from the King, as he wished to have the opinion of the Bishops of France before proceeding further, and they, with only four exceptions out of an assembly of fifty-four, made a strong protest in favor of the Society. But the Parliament, profiting by the King's dread of another attempt on his life like that of Damion, induced him to withdraw his edict, and then, by a decree dated April 1, 1762, closed the eighty-four colleges belonging to the Jesuits.[7]

[4] L'Abbé Proyart, "Louis XVV. détroné avant d'être Roi," Londres, 1800, p. 324.

[5] Rev. J. M. Prat, S. J., "Essai historique sur la destruction des Ordres Religieux en France au XVIIIth siècle," Paris, 1845, p. 149.

[6] L'Abbé I. Bertrand, "Le Pontificat de Pie VI. et l'Athéisme Revolutionnaire," Paris, 1879, pp. 75, 76, 235.

[7] Prat, *op. cit.*, p. 116. Henrion x., 432.

By another decree of August 6 the Parliament declared that the Society could no longer be allowed to exist. It expelled the fathers from their houses and forbade them to follow the rule of their order to live in community, to teach or to exercise any religious function unless they bound themselves by oath to accept the doctrines of the Gallican Church as expressed in the declaration of the French clergy in 1682.[8] Of the 4,000 Jesuits then in France only five submitted to this decree.[9] The Parliament then published a long report, known as the *"Extraits des Assertions,"* etc.,[10] which it had caused to be compiled, mainly with the help of some monks who were ardent Jansenists, a report which professed to expose the erroneous doctrines taught by the Jesuits, and in the 542 pages of which the fathers were able to point out when they published an answer to it in the course of the following year, no less than 758 misrepresentations and falsifications of the original texts.[11] It is only just to say that the Parliaments of Douai and Besançon and the Supreme Council of Alsace, as well as very large minorities in other provincial Parliaments, took up the defense of the Jesuits, but the Parliament of Paris would listen to no argument; it condemned the works written in favor of the Society to be burned by the executioner, and hanged a priest who at Brest had spoken disrespectfully of their proceedings.[12]

---

[8] Rev. A. M. Cahour, S. J., "Des Jésuites par un Jésuite," II., p. 226.

[9] Schoell, "Cours d'histoire des Etats Européens," vol. 40, p. 51; quoted by Cahour, *ibid*, p. 227.

[10] The complete title of the work is, "Extraits des Assertions dangereuses et pernicieuses en tout genre, que les soi-disant Jésuites ont dans tous les temps et persévérament, soutenues enseignées et publiées dans leurs livres, avec l'approbation de leurs supérieurs et généraux. Verifiées et collationnés par les Commissaires du Parlement en exécution de l'arrêt de la Cour du 31 Soût 1761 et arrêt du 3 Septembre suivant, surles livres, thèses, chiers composés dictés et publiés par les soi-disant Jésuites et autres actes authentiques. Déposés au Greffe de la Cour par arrêts des 3 Septembre 1761, 5, 17, 18, 26. Février et 5 Mars 1762. Paris, chez Pierre Guillaume Simon Imprimeur du Parlement, 1762." Cahour, *op. cit.*, p. 94.

[11] Cahour, *op. cit.*, p. 201.

[12] Prat, *op. cit.*, 129.

The following extract explains why the Jesuits allowed so much time to pass before replying to the "Extraits et Assertions:"

L'Abbé Dazès: Il est temps departer, ou Compte rendu an public des œuvres legales de M. Ripert de Monclar, et des événements passés en Provence et à Paris, etc., à l'occasion des Jésuites-À-Arles, 1764, t. II., p. 250. "Avant que de faire paraître le Livre des Assertions on avait en soin de fermer à Paris et à Lyon la Bibliothéque des Jesuites. La précaution était sage: ces Bibliothéques étaient imeneuses et bien composées. Quinze jours avec des livres auraient suffi pour confondre ce monstrueux recueil de calomnies et pour charger le parlement de Paris de tout l'opprobre, dont il voulait convrir les Jésuites; on avait prévu cet inconvénient, et le scellé prudemment appliqué aux grandes Bibliothéques de la Société, en avait été le remède . . . Paris a servi de modèle; à l'imitation de la Capitale, on a fermé en Provence les Bibliothéques des Jésuites: après quoi on les a invités à se défendre légalement sur toutes ces noirceurs que leur impute l'infâme Extrait des Assertions."

The Parliament also condemned to be burned the pastoral letter in which Mgr. Christophe de Beaumont, the Archbishop of Paris, supported by the other Bishops of France with but three exceptions,[13] denounced the iniquitous sentence, and at the request of the same body the King, incapable of resisting the evil influence of Madame de Pompadour and of the Duke de Choiseul, banished the courageous prelate to the monastery of La Trappe. It was in vain that Clement XIII. undertook the defense of the Society, and by a brief which he communicated privately to the French Cardinals declared the decrees of the Parliament to be null and void,[14] and that Queen Maria Leczinska and the Dauphin united their prayers and protests to those of the French clergy. They were unable to persuade the King to reject the decree of March 9, 1764, by which the Parliament of Paris, followed by those of Toulouse, Rouen and Pau,[15] ordered the Jesuit Fathers to ratify by an oath the truths of the accusations which had been brought against them in previous decrees or to be deprived of the small pension of 400 francs which had been allowed them, and to be banished from the country. Louis XV. by the royal edict of November, 1764, while declaring that he had no ill-will against the Jesuits, and that he yielded reluctantly merely with the object of restoring peace in his kingdom,[16] confirmed the sentence, though modifying it to the extent of allowing the fathers to remain in France as private persons; but the Parliament when registering the edict added as conditions that they should not come within ten leagues of Paris; that they should reside in the dioceses where they were born and report themselves every six months to the authorities.[17] The expulsion of the order from Spain, which took place shortly after, gave apparently a fresh stimulus to the animosity of the Parliament of Paris, and by another decree of May 9, 1767, which the King was requested to extend to all France, it enacted that all the Jesuits who had not taken the prescribed oath should be expelled within a fortnight, and the feeble monarch, who feared to irritate the turbulent magistrate, yielded again and signed the decree.[18]

In the other Catholic countries of Europe the war against the Society was carried on, as in France, by ministers imbued with the anti-Christian doctrines of the *"Encyclopedistes"* and partisans of the supremacy of the State over the Church, such as Sebastian Carvalho, Marquis of Pombal in Portugal, Count d'Aranda in Spain,

[13] Prat, *op. cit.*, p. 128.

[14] R. P. de Ravignan, S. J., "Clément XIII. et Clément XIV.," Paris, 1854, I., p. 145.

[15] Cahour, *op. cit.*, p. 231.

[16] Ravignan, *op. cit.*, p. 157.

[17] Henrion, *op. cit.*, xi., p. 187.

[18] Henrion, "Histoire générale de l'Eglise," x., p. 451.

Bernardo Tanucci in Naples, Guillaume du Tillot, Marquis of Felino in Parma, and between the years 1759 and 1768 the property of the Jesuit Fathers in those countries was confiscated, their colleges were closed and they were expelled from their missions in the Spanish and Portuguese colonies and deported to the Papal States under circumstances of the greatest brutality. As it was necessary also to ensure that these unjust and arbitrary proceedings on the part of these governments should be accepted and approved by public opinion, every country in Europe was inundated at the same time with scurrillous and calumnious writings calculated to inflame the minds of the people against the Society.[19] It is needless to enter into any further details on this subject, as it has been so fully treated in the article on Pombal published in the AMERICAN CATHOLIC QUARTERLY REVIEW of January, 1877, and in that on the suppression of the Jesuits in the number for October, 1888. It will suffice to say that the ministers of the Bourbon sovereigns, not content with the spoilation of the Society and its expulsion from their States, insisted on it abolition. The Spanish Ambassador in Rome, Don Jose Moñino, Count of Florida Blanca, was their most ardent and implacable foe, and as he threatened Clement XIV. with the suppression of all the religious orders in Spain and hinted even at the possibility of a schism in case of noncompliance with the wishes of his master, the Sovereign Pontiff yielded at last after a long resistance lest greater misfortunes should befall the Church.[20]

Owing to the spirit of revolt against the authority of Rome which the insubordination of the Jansenists had created in France, the disturbances and the angry controversies produced by the intervention of the Parliaments in questions of ecclesiastical discipline, and still more to the irreligion and hatred of Christianity which were being gradually diffused among all classes of society by the infidel literature which Voltaire, d'Alembert and their adherents were causing to be distributed gratuitously in every part of Europe, but especially in France, much relaxation and disorder prevailed in some religious houses and afforded to those who aimed at the total destruction of monastic life the opportunity which they sought. Such was not, however, the sentiment which inspired the General Assembly of the French Clergy, but the desire to put an end to these abuses, when in 1765 it resolved to request Pope Clement XIII. to name a commission of prelates who should institute an inquiry into the state of

[19] The Pere de Ravignan publishes (*op. cit.*, II.) a selection of fifty letters from those which were written by prelates from all parts of Europe to Clement XIII. in 1759 and 1760, in which they denounce these pamphlets as "libelli calumnüs, contumelüs, maledictisque referti."

[20] Crétineau-Joly, "Histoire de la Compagnie de Jésus," v., p. 350. Cahour, *op. cit.*, part II., p. 273.

the monastic orders and take steps to reëstablish obedience and the observation of the rule wherever it was necessary.[21] The Assembly informed Louis XV. of this resolution in order that he might instruct his ambassador in Rome to obtain the consent of the Holy Father, but the King, acting under the influence of de Choiseul, took the matter into his own hands by an edict dated 26th May, 1776, and, in spite of the remonstrances of the Assembly, by another edict of July 31 he created a board of five Archbishops, to whom he added five lay members of his council, some of whom were known to be hostile to the authority of the Holy See.[22] The president of this commission, named *La Commission de la Réforme,* was Loménie de Brienne, Archbishop of Toulouse, a secret adherent of *les philosophes* and a friend of d'Alembert, who helped to have him elected a member of the French Academy and praised him in his letters to Voltaire. The prelates associated with de Loménie, who alone was acquainted with the secret intentions of de Choiseul and the philosophers,[23] seem to have allowed themselves to be dominated by his stronger will, and not to have offered sufficient resistance to his insidious projects of reformation, of which perhaps they did not foresee the disastrous consequences, while the laymen, whose number could be augmented at the will of the commission, or rather of its president, were quite ready to take part in promoting any measures calculated to be prejudicial to the interests of the Church. As might have been expected under such circumstances, the reforms projected by de Loménie and his colleagues did not tend to appease the religious controversies raging throughout France or to restore discipline in the cloisters, but to excite still more discontent and insubordination among the more relaxed of the regular clergy, to provoke more hostility on the part of the public against the monastic orders, to reduce the number of religious and to suppress many ancient communities.[24]

Thus the age at which monastic vows might be pronounced was to be raised to 21 for men and to 18 for women, and all professions which in future might be made before that age were to be declared null. All monasteries containing less than fifteen monks, or in some special cases eight, were to be closed, and no order was to be allowed to possess more than two houses in Paris or one in any other town without a license from the King.[25]

The Council of State approved and confirmed these measures by two edicts in April, 1767, and in March, 1768, and the commission speedily carried out its operations, inspecting the religious houses,

21 Prat, *op. cit.*, p. 153.
22 *Ibid*, p. 157.
23 Barruel, *op. cit.*, I., p. 123.
24 Prat, *op. cit.*, p. 164.
25 *Ibid*, p. 192, p. 194.

revising and renovating their rules and statutes, uniting some orders together and secularizing others. These new codes and regulations were then sometimes submitted to the approbation of the Holy See,[26] but in most cases an edict of the weak-minded Louis XV. or of his equally incapable successor, Louis XVI., sufficed to ratify them and give them force of law, and before many years had elapsed the commission had suppressed several orders, disorganized many others by introducing into them a spirit of insubordination and closed more than 1,500 religious houses without heeding the opposition and the remonstrances of the General Assemblies of the French Clergy.[27]

The *"Commission de la Réforme,"* having thus completed its labors, tendered its resignation to Louis XVI., who by an edict of 19th March, 1780, thanked the members of it for having by their *"care* and *zeal"* provided the greater part of the religious congregations of his kingdom with a code of statutes and regulations which the superiors of these orders were commanded to obey. Another edict, however, of the same date reorganized the commission as a board for the purpose of examining demands for the suppression, the union or the translation of benefices and ecclesiastical property, and under its new form it continued to exercise its powers for the destruction of monastic life in France until even the Parliament of Paris accused it of destroying more than reforming and demanded its suppression.

These attempts to destroy the Church by gradually eliminating her most faithful defenders and by the circulation of anti-Christian literature were attended with greater success in France than in the southern countries of Europe, where, as a rule, the people still remained attached to their faith and the great majority of the clergy resisted all attempts to separate them from Rome. A large number, however, of the middle class were animated by the same spirit of hostility to the supremacy of the Holy See as the Jansenists, and many of the aristocracy had adopted the ideas of Voltaire and of the Encyclopedia and were guided by them in their relations with the Church.

Thus the Venetian Senate, which, indeed, had someitmes in past centuries already shown a tendency to interfere in purely ecclesiastical matters, published several decrees between 1767 and 1773 which were calculated to infringe the liberties and rights of the Church by the same methods as those which had been recommended by Frederick II. and were at that moment being employed in France. It was prohibited to make any donation or bequest to a church or a religious order without the permission of the Senate. The reception of any more novices in the mendicant orders was forbidden, and in

[26] *Ibid*, p. 207.
[27] Bertrand, *op. cit.*, p. 71.

the others it was not to be allowed until the age of 20, and the final vows were not to be pronounced until the age of 25. The superiors of religious houses were prohibited from inflicting any punishment on their monks without having recourse to lay tribunals, and all the regular clergy were also withdrawn from the jurisdiction of their generals residing in Rome and placed under that of the Bishops of their respective dioceses, especially with regard to the administration of the sacraments.[28] In 1770 nine of the Benedictine abbeys in the State of Venice were also suppressed; the monks were allowed a small pension out of their former possessions and the rest was confiscated. Clement XIII. protested strongly against this aggression on the rights of the Church, for he saw that the real object of the decrees was to annihilate the religious orders under the pretext of reforming them, and he ordered the Bishops not to make use of the powers conferred on them by the secular authorities. The Senate replied with most fervent expressions of its veneration for the Holy See and its filial affection for the Holy Father,[29] but it would not withdraw its edicts, and though the Venetian Bishops at first refused to submit to them, they yielded little by little and undertook the visitation of the monasteries. Clement XIII. died without having been able to subdue the obstinacy of the Senate, and his successor, Clement XIV., offered no further opposition to the execution of the decrees.[30]

The cunning policy suggested by Frederick II. was also put in practice in those Italian States which were ruled by members of the House of Bourbon, or rather by the ministers who governed in their name, and who took advantage of the absolute power claimed by the sovereign to invade the rights and plunder the possessions of the Church. The Duchies of Parma and Piacenza formed one of these principalities, a territory which had belonged to the Papal States since the year 730, when the inhabitants had rebelled against the Iconoclastic Emperor of Constantinople and put themselves under the authority of Pope Gregory II.[31]

In 1545 Pope Paul III. (Alessandro Farnese, 1534-1549), who had been married before entering the Church, gave these Duchies to his son, Pier-Luigi Farnese, to be held by him and his heirs male as a fief of the Holy See for the annual payment of 9,000 golden ducats. The male line of the Farnese came to an end in 1731 on the death of Duke Antonio, and the Duchies should have reunited to the rest of the Papal States, but by the treaty of London in 1728 between

[28] Gaetano Moroni, "Dizionario di erudizione Storico-Eccleciastica," Venezia, 1858, vol. 92, p. 595.

[29] *Ibid*, p. 600.

[30] *Ibid*, p. 603.

[31] *Op. cit.*, vol. 51, p. 222.

the Empire, France, Spain and Holland, Antonio's niece, Elizabeth Farnese, who in 1714 had married Philip V. of Bourbon, King of Spain, as his second wife, obtained the right to transmit them to her eldest son, Don Carlos, a right confirmed in 1722 and 1723 by the treaties of Cambray and of Vienna, in spite of the protests of Innocent XIII. (1721-1724). In the course of the war between France, Spain and Austria, caused by the disputed right of succession to the throne of Poland, Don Carlos, who had taken possession of the Duchies in 1732, became King of Naples under the title of Charles VII., and in 1735 the Duchies were ceded to Austria; but at the conclusion of the seven years' war between the pretendants to the title of Emperor of Germany, Parma and Piacenza were given to Don Philip de Bourbon, the younger brother of Don Carlos, by the treaty of Aix-la-Chapella (18th October, 1748), which disregarded and set aside the claims of the Holy See.

The young Duke, who had married the eldest daughter of Louis XV., had for his Prime Minister a French lawyer, Guillaume Léon du Tillot, whom his father-in-law had sent to assist him in his controversy with the Papal Government about the investiture of the Duchy. He was a good administrator, but like de Choiseul and Tanucci, he was a disciple of the Encyclopedists and acted according to their theories in his relations with the Sovereign Pontiff and the religious orders. He, therefore, is responsible for the Duke's refusal in 1764 to pay the usual tribute of 9,000 ducats, and this was followed by an edict by which testators were forbidden to bequeath to the Church more than one-twentieth of their fortune,[32] which should never be more than 300 crowns to be paid in ready money, and the members of monastic orders were obliged to renounce all rights of inheritance with the exception of a small annuity. The Duke died the following year, and during the minority of his son Don Ferdinand, du Tillot published on January 16, 1768 another edict by which it was prohibited to have recourse to foreign tribunals, not even to those of Rome, without the Duke's authorization, which would also be requisite for the collation of benefices and for the validity of any document emanating from the Roman Curia. Clement XIII., who had already often protested against previous measures of due Tillot prejudicial to the rights of the Church, but who had been led to believe that his remonstrances would be listened to, replied on January 30 to this last aggression by a monitorium which declared that this edict and all those which had preceded it were null and void, and that the persons who had had a share in their publication had incurred the censures of the Church. By way of reprisal du Tillot, imitating the action of the courts of France, Spain

[32] A. Coppi, "Annali d'Italia du 1750," Roma, 1828, p. 77.

and Naples, arrested all the Jesuit Fathers in the Duchies of Parma and Piacenza at nightfall on February 7 and sent them, escorted by soldiers, across the frontier of the Papal States; while, as a proof that the other Bourbon sovereigns approved of du Tillot's conduct, Louis XV. seized the town of Avignon and the Comtat Venaisin, possessions of the Church situated in France, and the Neapolitan Government not only occupied those in the Kingdom of Naples, such as Benevento and Ponte Corvo, but later on in the year sent troops to Orbitello, a fortress in Tuscany, with the intention of taking Castro and Ronciglione, towns in the Papal States, which had formerly been held by the Farnesi as fiefs, but had been restored to the Holy See since many years.[33]

The right claimed by the Duke of Parma of authorizing the publication of acts issuing from Rome and of thereby establishing their validity was known as the *Regium Placet* or *Exequatur,* and had frequently been the cause of protestations on the part of the Papal Government. It appears to have originated at the time of the great schism of the West, when it was often necessary to ascertain whether a Bull or a Brief proceeded from the lawfully elected Pope or from the Antipope, but it was abolished by Pope Martin V. in 1417, when peace had been restored to the Church, and had ceased to be employed for over a century,[34] until the Spanish Viceroys of Naples under Philip II. attempted to revive the practice. Thus the Count of Ayala in 1567 and the Count of Olivares in 1596 impeded the execution of certain Papal decrees because the *Exequatur* had not been demanded; but the former submitted after having been excommunicated by Mgr. Orsini, Bishop of Strongoli, the Apostolic Visitor, and the latter yielded to the energetic protests of Clement VIII. and desisted from his opposition.

The spirit of resistance to any manifestation of the authority of the Holy See persisted, nevertheless, in the Kingdom of Naples as in other Catholic States. It acquired greater development in the eighteenth century, according as the teaching of the French philosophers became more widely diffused among the nobility and the very numerous class connected in one way or another with the legal profession,[35] and it directed the policy of the ministers who succeeded

[33] Avignon and the comtat Venaissin, Benevento and Ponte Corvo were restored to the Church by the two Bourbon courts after the suppression of the Jesuits, but Clement XIV. had indignantly refused to make their restitution one of the conditions of his consent.

[34] Padre Flario Rinieri, S. J., "Della rovina di una Monarchia. Relazioni storiche tra Pio vi ela Corte di Napoli negli anni 1776-1799, secondo documenti inediti del'Archivio Vaticano," Torino, 1901. Introduzione, pp. xvi., xviii.

[35] Calculated at 26,000 in the city of Naples. Tivaroni, "L'Italia prima della Rivoluzione Francese," p. 335.

one another in the government of the country under Charles VII. of Bourbon and his incapable and illiterate son, Ferdinand IV.

Bernardo Tanucci (1698-1783), the first of these, was a lawyer from Tuscany, and had been professor of jurisprudence at the University of Pisa. His violent attack on the privilege of sanctuary which was enjoyed by the Church and of which a Spanish soldier had taken advantage, made him known to Don Carlos when he entered Tuscany at the head of his troops in 1732, as the acknowledged heir of Giovanni Gastone, the last Grand Duke of the House of Medici, and on his way to take possession of Parma and Piacenza. Tanucci then became auditor of the treasury to the Prince and one of his councillors, in which capacity he accompanied him in 1734 on the expedition which resulted in the conquest of the Kingdom of Naples. There he rose to be Minister of Justice, and in 1755 he was made Minister of Foreign Affairs and of the Royal Household.

When the Emperor Joseph II. visited Naples in 1769 he described Tanucci as being an intelligent and well informed man, but a hypocrite and an arrant pedant, full of little artifices and chicanery, which he looked upon as statesmanship, attaching great importance to trifles, extremely jealous of his authority and managing to keep in his own hands the distribution of all favors and places.[36] Like most lawyers of that time he was a strong upholder of the absolute authority of the sovereign in religious as well as civil matters, but he does not seem to have offered any opposition to the Concordat which was made in 1741 between Benedict XIV. and Charles VII., in which reciprocal concessions were made with regard to the right of sanctuary in churches, the taxation of church property, the constitution and jurisdiction of ecclesiastical and mixed tribunals and the collation of benefices.

This agreement was not, however, strictly observed for very long by the Neapolitan Government, which interpreted in its own favor, extended and sometimes even exceeded the conditions which had been stipulated.[37] Thus by successive edicts it was enacted that the number of priests should be limited to ten per thousand of the population; that the Church should acquire no more real property; that Papal Bulls should have no effect unless accepted by the King,[38] and that episcopal censures incurred by persons engaged in carrying out a law should be regarded as null. As an edict of the King's had forbidden the construction of new churches, convents or hos-

[36] A. von Arneth, "Maria Teresia und Joseph II. Ihre Correspondenz Wien, 1867," vol. I., p. 262. "Un pédant fieffé, rempli de petites finasseries et de chicanes."

[37] Pietro Colletta, "Storia del Reame di Napoli dal 1734 al 1825," Capalago, 1834, vol. I., p. 87.

[38] Which meant that the Exequatur was reëstablished.

pitals unless his permission had been obtained, a church which had been built in honor of the patron saint of a city in the Abruzzi was ordered to be demolished because the necessary formality had not been fulfilled.[39]

When Charles VII. succeeded in 1759 to the throne of Spain under the title of Charles III., on the death of his brother, Ferdinand VI., he transferred the crown of Naples to his third son, Ferdinand IV. (1751-1825), then aged eight, and confided him to the care of a Council of Regency, of which Tanucci formed part. In this position Tanucci found himself invested with almost absolute power over the Kingdom of Naples, and thenceforth he lost no opportunity of manifesting still more openly his animosity against the Church. His authority in the Council soon predominated over that of his co-regents, for he maintained a weekly correspondence with the King of Spain, who continued to direct from Madrid the policy and the acts of the Court of Naples.[40] A serious accusation has been made against Tanucci: that he let the young King grow up without giving him an education which would have rendered him capable of performing the duties of a sovereign,[41] and surrounded him with frivolous and incapable men, who allowed him to neglect his studies and give himself up almost exclusively to field sports,[42] so that when he attained his majority at the age of sixteen he knew little more than how to read and write.[43] Ignorant and coarse, but kind-hearted, indulgent and not deficient in common sense, vulgar in appearance and with the manners and language of a Neapolitan *lazzarone,* which caused him to be idolized by the lower orders, King Ferdinand had an intense aversion to business and left state affairs as much as possible to his ministers and to his wife, the Austrian Archduchess Maria Carolina (1752-1814), the daughter of the Empress Maria Teresa, spending his time as much as possible shooting pheasants in the Island of Procida or hunting deer and wild boar in the forests of

---

[39] Colletta, p. 88.

[40] Danvila y Collado, "Reinado de Carlos III.," Madrid, 1893, vol. I., p. 138, and II., p. 49. Janucci's correspondence with the Neapolitan ambassadors at Madrid and with Charles III. from 1736 to the eve of his death, on April 28, 1783, in 110 in-folio volumes, as well as that of the King with Janucci from 1759 to 1782, in 39 in-quarto volumes, is preserved in the Spanish Archives at Simancas and in the General Central Archives at Alcalà de Henares.

[41] Rinieri, *op. cit.,* xlii. Henrion, "Histoire générale de l'Eglise," t. xi., p. 132.

[42] Pietro Calà Ulloa, Duca di Lauria, "Intorno alla Storia del Reame di Napoli di Pietro Colleta," Napoli, 1877. The Duke defends Janucci and throws all the blame on the Prince of San Nicandro, the King's tutor, who had been chosen, as well as the other members of the regency, by the King's father.

[43] Rinieri, *ibid.*

Persano and Venafro, or catching fish in the lakes of Patria and Fusano, which he afterwards sold on the quay, bargaining and disputing with his customers like one of the populace.[44] His mind had, however, been filled from his earliest years with the most exaggerated ideas of the unlimited authority of a sovereign and the prerogatives of the crown, of which his ministers adroitly took advantage and were thus able to render a King who was not deficient in religious sentiments or in respect for the Holy Father[45] one of their most serviceable tools in their warfare against the Church.

They could also reckon on the coöperation of the Queen, a restless and ambitious woman, with a strong will and a passion for intrigue, which she was enabled to satisfy when, after the birth of her first son, in 1774, she was allowed to take part in the deliberations of the Council of State,[46] and it is not surprising that the sister of Joseph II. of Austria and of Leopold of Tuscany should have been frequently guided by their advice and have sought to imitate their schismatical attempts to establish the supremacy of the Church over the State.

Tanucci, therefore, who ruled despotically over the King's court and even over his private life, especially during his minority and the early years of his reign,[47] found no obstacles in his way when carrying out his plans for enslaving the Neapolitan Church and severing every link which united her prelates with Rome. Thus the tithes paid to the clergy were suppressed; the revenues of vacant bishoprics and benefices were seized by the State; the number of priests allowed to be consecrated, which Charles VII. had reduced to ten per thousand of the population, was still further reduced to five; only sons were forbidden to enter the Church, and no family was allowed to have more than one son in holy orders.[48] Tanucci also declared that the rights of the crown could not be alienated; that the most ancient Papal documents were null and void if they had not been confirmed by the King's acceptance of them; that any concessions made to the Church by a King could be revoked by the same King or by his successors; that the will of a founder could be suppressed or modified

[44] Tivaroni, *op. cit.*, p. 414. Colletta, *op. cit.*, p. 138.

[45] Rinieri, *op. cit.*, p. 106.

[46] It was one of the stipulations of the marriage contract.

[47] Von Arneth, *op. cit.*, I., p. 262. "Il tient, outre cela la bourse, tant du Roi que de la Reine . . . Il se rend agréable par les faveurs qu'il accorde du Roi dans la collation des charges, pour les quelles le Roi doit réelement le supplier, de même quand il veut faire une dépense pour son plaisir, ou quand il veut, animé par la Reine, prendre la moindre liberté sur son étiquette espagnole, comme par exemple pour souper seulement au jardin il faut une négociation préalable, et une concession par écrit de M. Tanucci, pour que le Roi puisse la faire." Report sent by Joseph II. to Maria Teresa about the Court of Naples, in April, 1769.

[48] Colletta, *op. cit.*, p. 135.

according to the pleasure of the sovereign;[49] that marriage was essentially a civil contract, and that the sacrament was only an accessory. Tanucci also suppressed ten monasteries in the Kingdom of Naples and seventy-eight in the Island of Sicily;[50] the Bishops were forbidden to interfere in educational matters or to publish any document not approved by the King; the boundaries of several dioceses were changed without consulting the Pope, and every appeal to Rome without the King's permission was prohibited. When the King of Spain caused all the Jesuit Fathers in his dominions to be seized and deported to the Papal States, Tanucci willingly followed his example, and as Ferdinand refused to sign an edict for the expulsion of the members of the Society from Naples, he forced him to yield by employing his usual argument—the express commands of Charles III.[51] In virtue of this decree the 630 Jesuits then in the kingdom of the two Sicilies, who had frequently been assured by Tanucci that they would not be expelled, were arrested during the night of November 20, 1767; 212 of these who were coadjutors or novices were obliged to return to their families; 65 who were too aged to undergo the fatigue of a voyage were sent to reside in different monasteries, and the others, to the number of 353, were escorted by soldiers across the frontier of the Papal States or disembarked on its shores near Terracina.

It was while the clergy was being thus hampered and deprived of their jurisdiction and their independence by sovereigns who still claimed the right to call themselves Catholic, and that the destruction of one religious order after another was allowing greater liberty to the band of atheists who were already rejoicing in the approaching downfall of the Church,[52] that the Conclave which assembled on October 5, 1774, after the death of Clement XIV., elected as Pope, on February 15, 1775, Cardinal Giovanni Angelo Braschi, who took the name of Pius VI. The new Pontiff, who was born at Cesena, in the province of Romagna, on December 27, 1717, of a noble family, had received his early education at the Jesuits' college of his native town, whence he proceeded to the University of Ferrara to perfect

[49] Tivaroni, *op. cit.*, p. 407.

[50] Henrion, "Histoire générale de l'Eglise," t. xi., p. 362.

[51] Von Arneth, *op. cit.*, p. 263. "Le Roi de Naples d'un autre côte est continuellement intimidé par Janucci qui lui représente la cotère de son père, et qui fait même écrire au Roi d'Espagne là-dessus tout ce qu'il veut. Le Roi qui est naturellement timide et inappliqué, est charmé d'avoir un prétexte pour faire toutes les choses que la lumière même de sa raison désapprouve, et il se sert du prétexte de son papa dans toutes les occasions où cela lui convient." Joseph II. to Maria Teresa, 1769.

[52] "Cet édifice frappé par ses fondements va s'écrouler, et les nations transcriront dans leurs annales que Voltaire fut le promoteur de cette, révolution." Frederick II. to Voltaire, May 5, 1767. Quoted by Bertrand, *op. cit.*, p. 62.

himself in the study of law under the guidance of his uncle, Carlo Bandi, who was the auditor of Cardinal Ruffo, the Papal Legate. Chosen by the Cardinal to be his secretary, he accompanied him to Rome in 1740, where as his conclavist he assisted with him at the election of Cardinal Prospero Lambertini, who took the name of Benedict XIV. The Abate Braschi, who already intended to enter the Church, then became the Cardinal's auditor, and was charged with the administration of the Diocese of Ostia and Velletri, in which capacity, as well as in a diplomatic mission on which he was sent to the Court of Naples, he showed so much talent that Benedict XIV., in 1755, made him his secretary and *"cameriere secreto,"* as well as a Canon of the Basilica of St. Peter's, and shortly afterwards he was ordained priest.

When Clement XIII. succeeded Benedict XIV., in 1758, the Pope's nephew, Cardinal Rezzonico, who was Camerlengho, or Prefect of the Apostolic Camera, chose Mgr. Braschi for his auditor, and in this important post he gave such proofs of energy and of a thorough knowledge of economical questions that in 1766 he was named Treasurer General, one of the highest posts under the Papal Government. Mgr. Braschi held this important position for nine years, during which his administration was distinguished by the most scrupulous integrity, by his severe supervision over his subordinates and by the desire to remedy whatever abuses had existed under his predecessors.[53] In 1773 he was raised by Clement XIV. to the dignity of Cardinal, and then withdrew to the Abbey of Subiaco, which he held *in commendam,* where he passed his time in study until his election to the Chair of St. Peter.

The experience which Pius VI. had acquired in the different official positions which he had held, and especially in that of Treasurer, was soon turned to good account for the purpose of carrying out various reforms and developing the resources of the Papal States. A large number of pensions which had been too generously and imprudently granted by preceding governments were suppressed, and a commission of Cardinals was named to examine the existing system of taxation and to modify it so as to render it more profitable to the State and less oppressive to the people. Duties were also imposed on foreign merchandise for the protection and development of native industry, and the result of these operations was to increase the revenues of the Papal Treasury by a third more than they had been under Clement XIV.[54] Important public works were also carried out in various parts of the Papal States. The marshy lands

[53] Abate Francesco Beccatini, "Storia di Pio VI.," Venezia, 1841, vol. I., p. 20.

[54] *La Civiltá Cattolica,* 5 Agosto, 1899, p. 267. Beccatini, I., p. 40.

surrounding Città della Pieve, as well as those in the neighborhood of Perugia, Spoleto and Trevi, were drained; the harbors of Porto d'Anzio and of Ferracina were deepened; the State prisons in the fortress of San Leo were rebuilt and rendered more commodious; the prisoners were freed from their chains and provided with better food.[55] In Rome Saint Peter's was embellished by the construction of a new sacristy and the *Museo Pio-Clementino* was completed. The addition of this gallery to the palace of the Vatican for the purpose of containing the collections of statuary formed by several Popes since the time of JuliusII., had been suggested to Clement XIV. by Mgr. Braschi when Treasurer, and Pius VI. enriched it with more than 2,000 ancient works of art, the result of excavations in or around Rome.

But the most remarkable of the works undertaken by Pius VI., and one which alone would have sufficed to illustrate his reign, was the drainage of the Pontine Marshes. This vast extent of swamp, about 25 miles long by 8 to 10 broad, which stretched along the coast at the foot of the Volscian Mountains, and is separated from the sea by a long and narrow sandy plain covered with dense woods, was once a thickly inhabited, well cultivated territory in the days which preceded the foundation of Rome, and in the fifth century before Christ it was there that the Romans in times of scarcity sent to purchase corn. But the conquest of the Volscian land in the early times of the Roman Republic, by laying the country waste and slaughtering the inhabitants, or leading them away into captivity, in order to replace them by small colonies of Roman citizens, began the downfall of its prosperity. The low-lying plain, liable to be frequently inundated by mountain torrents, had been rendered habitable only by an extensive system of drainage, traces of which still remain, and by the continual labor of the numerous population which inhabited the thirty-three small towns mentioned by Pliny;[56] but with their disappearance it gradually passed into the condition of a pestilential morass. Before, however, the district had sunk into this state, the Censor, Appius Claudius, in 312 B. C., constructed through the midst of it the road from Rome to Capua, which bears his name, and the canal along which is believed to have been made by the Consul M. Cornelius Cethegus in 160 B. C. Julius Cæsar formed the project of draining these marshes, but it was never carried out, though while the Roman Empire lasted the Appian Way was frequently restored and was again reconstructed under Theodoric, King

[55] Tavanti, Giov. Battista, "Fasti del S. P. Pio VI.," Italia, 1804, I., p. 165; II., pp. 12, 13.

[56] René de la Blanchère, "Un chapitre d'histoire pontine. Mémoires présentés à l'Académie des Inscriptions et Belles-Lettres," Paris, 1893, tome x.

of the Ostrogoths (454-526). During the Middle Ages, an epoch of continual warfare, no measures could be taken to check the devastation caused by the inundations of the rivers descending from the Volscian Mountains, and though Leo X. and Sixtus V. made some attempts at reclamation and caused two canals to be dug, and plans for the same purpose were drawn up under the reigns of Benedict XIV., Clement XIII. and Clement XIV., they were attended with no very efficacious results. When in 1777 Pius VI. resolved to begin his colossal undertaking the Appian Way was in some places broken and sunk in the swamp, in others overflowed by torrents which could find no outlet through the ruined bridges and which kept a great portion of the land continually submerged. At that date 48,469 acres of the Pontine Marshes were under water all the year round, while in the district comprising the basins of the river which flow into them, 26,444 acres were inundated during part of the year and 248,831 acres were susceptible of being much improved by their neighborhood to the drainage works.[57]

The plans for the drainage of the Pontine Marshes were made by a Bolognese engineer, Gaetano Rapini, and in December, 1777, 3,500 men were set to work. In 1784 the Appian Way had been rebuilt considerably above its original level, the canal running alongside of it had been reopened, and before many years had elapsed the annual produce of the reclaimed lands amounted to 97,200 bushels of corn and 194,000 of maize.[58] In 1792 the works had already cost 8,677,611 francs ($1,621,983), and though from time to time much damage was occasioned by inundations, the works were continued until 1796, and would have received further development if they had not been stopped by the invasion of the French revolutionary armies.

At the time of the election of Pius VI. Tanucci was still in power and still continued to seize every opportunity of manifesting his animosity towards the Holy See. It was the year of the Jubilee, and the usual indulgence had been granted to those who should visit, while it lasted, the four principal churches of Rome; but with the intention probably of expressing his desire of completely separating the Kingdom of Naples from Rome, Tanucci persuaded the King to publish an edict to the effect that to obtain these spiritual graces it would be quite enough to visit the four principal churches of Naples.[59] He then informed the Holy Father that since he refused to confer on Mgr. Filangieri, the Archbishop of Naples, the

---

[57] De Prony, "Description Hydrographique et Historique des Marais Pontins," Paris, 1822, p. 94.

[58] *Ibid*, p. 230.

[59] Henrion, *op. cit.*, xi., p. 362.

dignity of Cardinal, which had been usually held by his predecessors, the King would establish in his States a body of clergy clothed in red like the Cardinals. The threat was never carried out, but the Papal Nuncio at Naples was fully justified in stating in a letter to Rome, in September, 1776: "The principle which rules here is that the King's legislative authority extends also to ecclesiastical matters."[60]

Tanucci's domination was, however, drawing to its close. During his long tenure of office he had so persistently made war on the liberties and possessions of the Church, treating both the secular and regular clergy as dangerous enemies of the State, who should be deprived of all influence and wealth, that he had taken no notice of the progress made by Freemasonry, which had been introduced into Naples probably about 1745 (for the exact date is uncertain), had spread rapidly in all parts of the kingdom in a few years and reckoned many priests and nobles in its lodges. It was only in 1751, when Pope Benedict XIV. had renewed the censures pronounced against Freemasonry by Clement XII. in 1738, that Charles VII. published an edict by which the association was suppressed and his subjects forbidden to form part of it. Its head at Naples, Don Raimondo di Sangro, Prince of San Severo, the first Italian who was Grand Master, promised to abandon it, but the edict remained a dead letter and the lodges continued to multiply and to meet secretly, diffusing without restraint their anti-Christian and anti-monarchical doctrines, while monasteries were being suppressed, religious orders plundered and the Jesuits especially made the victims of a relentless persecution.[61] It was only in April, 1775, that King Ferdinand seems to have had his attention called to the matter by a general officer and informed his father that a number of persons of high rank at his court were Freemasons, and that the country was full of them; but when Charles III. expressed the desire that they should be suppressed he found that the Queen's influence presented an insurmountable obstacle.

Maria Carolina had come from a court where the Freemasons had been longer in power and more openly than in Naples; "she had grown up in an atmosphere of Freemasonry."[62] Her brother, the Emperor Joseph II., is suspected of having been a Freemason, and her father, Duke Francis of Lorraine, the husband of the Empress Maria Teresa, was enrolled among them. King Ferdinand's correspondence with Charles III. is full of piteous complaints of his wife's tyrannical conduct towards him on account of his desire to obey his

[60] Rinieri, *op. cit.*, Introduzione, p. lvii.
[61] Rinieri, *op. cit.*, p. 395.
[62] Rinieri, *op. cit.*, p. 386.

father; she had found him in tears caused by the reproaches in his father's letters, and had told him contemptuously not to mind them; she protected the Freemasons and assisted at their banquets; she had even asked him to become a Freemason, but he had always refused; she was instigated in her acts by the Court of Vienna, and she always insisted on reading his letters, but would never allow him to read hers.

At last Tanucci, who was extremely jealous of his authority and who saw that the Freemasons, among whom were a large number of members of the aristocracy, were helping the Queen to acquire supreme power at the court, declared war against the sect, and by a royal edict published in September, 1775, the Freemasons were denounced as guilty of high treason and their meetings prohibited; but, though the principal members ostensibly submitted and promised to abandon the association, the lodges still continued to assemble, though in greater secrecy than before. By Tanucci's orders a police magistrate named Gaetano Pallante then surprised, in March, 1776, a lodge while it was engaged in the reception of a candidate at a meeting which had been convoked by spies in his pay, and the prisoners were sent for trial before the *"Giunta di Stato,"* a court for the trial of crimes against the State. Intrigues were at once set on foot to obtain the acquittal of the accused. Petitions were sent to the Queen from all sides, powerful personages sought to intimidate the judges, the fall of Tanucci was decided, and Ferdinand writing to his father in June, 1776, evidently at the Queen's suggestion, asked to be allowed to dismiss the minister, as his great age had rendered him incapable of administering the affairs of the kingdom. Charles III. refused to accede to this request, though he was not aware that its object was to save the Freemasons; but on October 25, 1776, Tanucci was informed by a note from the King that he had ceased to exercise his functions.[63] He was, however, allowed to remain in charge of the trial of the Freemasons, but the *Giunta* now took the defense of the accused. The meeting at which they had been arrested was not, it was said, meant to be a serious matter; it was a mere jest, and had been convoked at the instigation of Pallante, who had promised immunity to his spies. All proceedings against the prisoners were, therefore, quashed; they were declared not guilty and were set free, while Pallante was made to appear the real culprit and was banished to thirty miles from the city of Naples. The health of Maria Carolina, the protectress of the Freemasons, was drunk at Masonic banquets throughout France, Italy and Germany, and a medal was struck in commemoration of the event;[64] but

[63] Rinieri, *op. cit.*, p. 410.
[64] Rinieri, *op. cit.*, p. 424.

Tanucci had to submit in silence to his defeat lest he should draw down the Queen's anger upon himself, for he had amassed great wealth, and he feared for his possessions. His successor as Prime Minister was the Marquis de la Sambuca, a Sicilian nobleman who had been Ambassador at Vienna; and under his administration the same irritating policy of interference in every detail of ecclesiastical discipline was carried to even greater lengths than previously, and constituted one of the most painful trials to which Pius VI. was subjected.

DONAT SAMPSON.

London, England.

---

## OUR LADY OF GUADALUPE.

TO THE majority of educated Americans the name Guadalupe Hidalgo is familiar as the place where the treaty which closed the war with Mexico was signed in 1848. For Catholics the suburb of the Mexican capital has a higher interest of a kind distinct from politics. It is the seat of the oldest and most remarkable shrine and pilgrimage in the New World, comparable indeed in many respects with those of Loretto, Assisi and Mount Alvernia. The city itself is insignificant, and counts only some six or seven thousand inhabitants, but on the patronal festival, the 12th of December, which is also that of the Mexican nation, the crowd of pilgrims and visitors often reaches a quarter of a million. These conditions have been scarcely changed during three centuries, as the Mexican annals tell us. In 1625 Guadalupe was credited with five thousand inhabitants, and long before that time it was noted as a place to which "great crowds came with special devotion to venerate the sacred picture there." The town is scarcely two miles from the capital, with which it is connected by a railroad since 1857. The service is now by horse cars, and Guadalupe is really a part of the City of Mexico, though with a municipality of its own.

The site is not attractive of residents in itself, though picturesque. It is at the foot of a rocky hill, the sides of which are dotted with thorny cactus and "Spanish bayonets," and beyond which a range of arid mountains rises towards the north. The shallow Lake of Texcoco to the east, and two streams, which in the rainy season become torrents, to the west, give natural limits that cannot be passed to the town's extension. The soil around is mostly alkaline and barren, and the wells mineral in character, and though medicinal,

unfit for common use. These conditions sufficiently account for the absence of any large population at Guadalupe, but the number and importance of the buildings there is in strange contrast to the fewness of inhabitants. Water is brought nearly three leagues for domestic use on a noble aqueduct of twenty-three hundred arches in masonry. The road to Mexico is bordered with chapels dedicated to the mysteries of the Holy Rosary, solidly built in the same material. The houses are also solidly built and show marks of antiquity in their construction sufficient to indicate that Guadalupe is not a place of yesterday. The central point of the town, architecturally, is the great group of the basilica and collegiate buildings connected with it. They are in the classic style of architecture with a wide plaza around the group and the mountain immediately behind their enclosure. The grouping is somewhat like that of a Californian mission. The basilica stands on the west side with towers at its four angles and a dome of Spanish fashion over its centre. A long and lofty building runs almost in a line with the front of the basilica towards the east, and a dome in its centre indicates the existence of a second church there in other days. A plainer church, without a dome, stands away back at the corner of the square formed by the basilica with the conventual buildings. Still further away in the same direction another dome indicates the place of another church. The mountain behind is crowned by a fifth domed structure, the ascent to which is marked by massive walls in masonry, beyond which a curious monument raises itself high in the air. It is the imitation in stone of a ship's mast with all sail set, and was the votive offering of a crew that attributed its preservation in shipwreck to the protection of Our Lady of Guadalupe long years ago.

The whole atmosphere of the town is, if we may so say it, a religious one. Masses are constantly being celebrated all through morning hours in the various churches, the basilica, that of the Indians, as the building adjoining the enclosure is styled, the sanctuary on the hill and that of the Well, the other two domed chapels. The Church of the Hill is quite modern, having been rebuilt in 1882, and the basilica seems constantly receiving repairs or additions. It is a noble building, both inside and outside. Its length is somewhat over two hundred feet, its width about a hundred and twenty, divided into nave and side aisles. The floors are in Mosaic of hardwoods, the lining of the walls marbles of various colors. Several fine oil paintings of recent execution decorate the interior. The altar of the miraculous picture is of elaborate workmanship as well as materials. The peculiar Spanish instinct for using the most costly material in the service of religion finds full expansion here. The inner frame of Our Lady's picture above the high altar is of pure

gold, the outer one of massive silver, as are many of the lamps and other furniture. The question of Judas, "Could not this ointment be sold for three hundred denarii and its price given to the poor?" is not asked by poor or rich in Mexico. "Is anything too good for Our Lady's service?" is the general remark of all classes when questioned on the subject by strangers of a more practical turn of mind, who are only lavish on public libraries, halls of fame and State Capitols.

The picture of Our Lady of Guadalupe itself is indeed the central fact in the existence of all these churches, as well as of the special devotion of the Mexican people to the Mother of God. It is always open to the public view in its place above the high altar, and its occasional removal to other places have been carried out with a solemnity and reverence to which it is hard to find comparison elsewhere. Viewed as a picture, it is singularly beautiful, yet it belongs to no school of art. There is nothing resembling it in the works of the European schools except so far as it has been copied since its own appearance. The cloth on which it is impressed is a coarse fabric like sackcloth and about five and a half feet by forty inches in dimensions. The figure of Our Lady is nearly four feet in height and may be called life size. She stands on a crescent moon with the hands joined on the breast and the head slightly inclined forwards. The hands and features are exquisitely modeled and of a flesh tint that may be called Eastern, but is neither Spanish nor Indian. The flowing robe of scarlets and purples in varying shades is like that, it is said, of the Mexican Indian women of rank. It is covered with flower patterns of conventional rather than realistic form, lightly lined with gold. The outer cloak is blue, shading towards green, and is surrounded by gold rays, beyond which is a border of small white clouds. On the head is a golden crown of conventional form, and an angel supports the moon below, with wings outstretched and only the upper part of the body shown above the clouds. The effect of the whole is as if the figure were standing before the sun, whose rays are visible all around it. The conception and execution have absolutely nothing in common with either the Spanish or Indian pictures used at the time when it was given to Lumarraga or to any Mexican school during the sixteenth century at least.

The materials used to produce the colors in the picture and their mode of application are facts for which science down to the present day fails to account. It has been submitted to commissions of artists and scientists more than once, notably in 1666 and 1794. The statements of all were that there was no sign whatever of lead or other priming on the cloth, and further that without such it is impossible

to paint upon it. The fabric is woven from fibres of the wild palm known in Mexico as izcotl, and used by the poorer class as a dress material. It is too porous to receive color on its surface with any regularity, and the weaving is so coarse that the light can be seen distinctly through. The back of the cloth of the picture is quite plain and shows no trace of other tint than its own. It is also rough in texture, while the front is smoothed by some means unknown to art. The colors seem incorporated directly into the material as images of objects are sometimes impressed on others by electric discharges or temporarily by a magic lantern. The picture further seems in execution as if partly done in oil, partly in water color, pastels and distemper besides the gold. No painter so far has found the secret of uniting these different processes in a congruous and perfect composition, as that of Guadalupe is beyond question.

The gold used so freely in the crown, drapery and sun rays is still more inexplicable according to the testimony of the artists who have examined it. One of them, Cabrera, stated that at first sight he believed it gold in fine powder which could be blown off with the breath. He found, however, that it was solidly fixed in the body of the fibres, though at first sight suggesting comparison with the metallic powder on the wings of a butterfly. The same appearance can be noted to-day, two centuries since Cabrera made his examination.

The durability of both tints and the material under them is indeed as inexplicable by any modern science as their origin. This picture on its ayate canvas has been nearly four centuries in its present place, exposed to the effects of sun and air, the smoke of thousands of lamps burning around it and the alterations of temperature of a tropical climate, alternately dry and damp in excess. It was for more than a hundred years without even the protection of glass, and its existence goes back to the lifetime of Michelangelo and Titian. All familiar with old pictures know how the masterpieces of art of human origin have, without exception, suffered fading and obscuration from the passage of time, but this figure and its surroundings show no sign of discoloration. Decay's effacing fingers have been powerless on it. Its guardians unanimously assert that neither dust nor soot ever settles on its surface, though they do in abundance on the glass, even internally, and the frame. The countless moths, ants and other insect destroyers so common in Mexico have never touched its frail fibres. The ayate cloth is as perishable in its own nature as it is common. Colors of all other kinds fade more rapidly in Guadalupe than in any European country, owing to its changes of temperature and the clouds of alkaline dust which fill the air in the dry season. Oil, distemper and gilding alike are speedily worn

away in the other pictures of the various churches within a few years. A special case is recorded of a copy of the miraculous picture made with special care by a celebrated Spanish painter, Bartolache, in 1789. He had a canvas prepared from the same material as that of the miraculous picture and treated with all mechanical methods known to him to fit it for artist's use. The copy was a fine one, though it failed to give the peculiarities of the original in the mingled appearance of oil, water and pastel colors. Senor Bartolache's copy was placed in the Church of the Well near by, but within seven years its colors had so changed that it was removed to the sacristy, where it perished completely within a few more years. The blues had become dirty greens, the other tints ash color and even mouldy. What the tints of the original are to-day can be seen by any observer. That it has received no aid from the retoucher is equally patent both from artists' inspection and from the records of the sanctuary, not to mention the publicity which would necessarily attend any interference with so sacred an object.

The authorship, the coloring and the durability of the picture of Guadalupe are thus all three beyond explanation by human science of the twentieth century, as by that of the four preceding it. Yet they are facts patent to the senses and confirmed by the testimony of fifteen generations of observers of all classes, friendly or hostile. History offers an explanation based on a supernatural manifestation in the past clearly told in detail. It is accepted with full confidence by the whole population familiar with it, both as reasonable in itself and as in accordance with Catholic faith. Clergy and laity, rich and poor, Spanish Creoles and Indians of native race agree in this acceptance. They further believe without doubt that a supernatural grace for the diffusion of spiritual and temporal blessings of God among men attaches to the picture as well as its marvelous physical properties. That belief finds and has found through three centuries practical expression in public acts. The Holy Picture of Guadalupe was carried from its shrine to the Cathedral of Mexico in solemn procession by joint action of the chapter, Archbishop and Town Council in 1629 as a protection against the sudden and prolonged rising of the waters of the adjoining lakes, which then threatened to permanently occupy the site of the city. Their recession after five years was attributed without hesitation to the influence of the Blessed Virgin in connection with the reverence shown her image. A similar public function was adopted by Church and State authorities in 1757 on occasion of an epidemic, and its cessation within a few days was confidently ascribed to the same influence. Of supernatural favors to individuals received at the shrine of Guadalupe the list is so like the history of Lourdes or St. Anne of Beauprè that we may

be dispensed from further illustration. In both public and individual cases the influence attributed to the picture itself by Mexican Catholics is the same as that which the converts of St. Paul believed to attach to the handkerchiefs and cloths which touched the body of the Apostle. It is a grace united to particular material objects by the Divine Will, and to be profited of in that form by believing Christians without command of so profiting. That grace of a supernatural kind can be and often is united by God's dispensation to material objects is a doctrine which Catholics must receive as part of their faith. To what objects it is so united in particular cases is left to the individual reason's assent, subject to the Church's authority should it see fit to pronounce a judgment in the matter.

The Mexican people almost unanimously believe that the picture of Guadalupe is supernatural and founds its assent both on its intrinsic qualities and the account of its origin handed down by history. The one confirms the other, and the duration of the belief during nearly four centuries adds additional strength to the motives of belief. It is a test alike sanctioned by Cicero and Gamaliel that time destroys false beliefs and confirms true ones. The account is that in December, 1531, an Indian convert while going from his home at a neighboring village to attend Mass and instructions in Mexico was arrested at the rocky peak overlooking the present town by celestial music. He climbed the peak to seek its source, and there was met by a lady of heavenly beauty, who addressed him affectionately and bade him go to the Bishop and tell him she desired a shrine built in her honor at that place. The Indian, Juan Diego, obeyed and called at the residence of Bishop Lumarraga with the message. The Bishop received him kindly, but doubted the value of his message, and told Juan Diego to return another day, when he would have more time to hear his story.

The Indian returned directly to the rock where the lady had first spoken to him and found her there again. He told the ill success of his visit and asked that she send some person of rank to accomplish her design. The lady bade him return the next day to the Bishop, repeat to him her first message, and further that she who sent was the ever Holy Virgin Mary, Mother of God. He followed her command faithfully, and with much difficulty got admission. Bishop Lumarraga heard him with more attention, but doubted the accuracy of his story. He dismissed Juan Diego with the remark: "If she wishes to obtain what she desires, more than words are needed. Some sign is necessary to let me know that she who sends is indeed the Queen of Heaven." With this answer Juan Diego departed, promising to ask the needed sign from the lady.

He could not go to the rock the following day on account of the

sudden and severe illness of an uncle, Juan Bernardino. He was employed finding him a medical attendant the next day, and early the following morning set out to Mexico to bring one of the Franciscans to his assistance. In his anxiety to get the priest at once he decided not to mount the rock where the vision had appeared to him on the two former occasions, but as he passed near its base the same lady met him. Juan Diego prostrated himself before her and told with simplicity that he was going to seek a priest for his dying relative, but when that was accomplished he would return the next day to tell her the result of her message. She heard him graciously, assured him that his uncle had already recovered, and promised himself her own protection. The Indian then told the message of Lumarraga. The lady bade him climb the peak where she had first spoken to him and gather the flowers he would find there as the needed token of her will. Juan Diego obeyed and found the rocks covered with beautiful flowers of European kinds, roses and lilies being prominent. He gathered a quantity of them and carried them to the lady in the fold of the tilma or blanket which he wore in native fashion over his blouse. She arranged them with her own hands in that receptacle and told the messenger to fold the tilma over them and carry them to the Bishop as her sign that she desired a temple built on the place in her honor. She further charged him not on any account to open his blanket to view until he should meet the Bishop himself.

Juan Diego carried out her instructions. He had difficulty in getting admission from the porters, who even tried to take some of the flowers from him, but found they could not detach them. When at last he got audience with Lumarraga he told his message and opened his tilma to shake the flowers on the floor. As he did so the picture was seen engraved on the front of the garment. The Bishop and all present were alike astounded and convinced of the Indian's truthfulness. The former reverently removed the tilma from the shoulders of the native and carried it to his oratory. The next day he sent some of his household with him to the cabin where Juan Bernardino had been left ill. They found him perfectly recovered, and he, too, told how at the time when Juan Diego was stopped by the lady on his road she had appeared to himself, healed him and bade him tell the Bishop that the name of the picture should be Holy Mary of Guadalupe. They brought Juan Bernardino to the Bishop, before whom he repeated his statement on oath. The Bishop then removed the picture to the pro-Cathedral of Mexico, where it was exposed to public devotion until a chapel could be built on the spot indicated by Juan Diego as the place of his last meeting with the Blessed Virgin. When that was completed the miraculous

picture was carried to it and became the centre of devotion to the population, native and Spanish.

Such in summary are the facts told in connection with the origin of the picture. That they are possible in the supernatural order will not be questioned by any Catholic. The authority of the two Indian messengers who alone received the favor of the four apparitions must rest for others as for Lumarraga on the miraculous character of the material proofs they brought, and of which the principal still remains. The picture and the explanation of its origin were given through the same hand, and the first confirms faith for the second. Of supernatural facts the only judge is the supernatural authority of the Church itself. Its verdict on those of Guadalupe was rendered first by the Bishop of Mexico and his successors and confirmed more than two hundred years later by the Sovereign Pontiff Benedict XIV. and since by Leo XIII.

The verbal statements for which credence was asked in connection with the picture are extremely few. They are only that a supernatural personage who declared herself to be the Mother of God appeared to two Indians of humble position and told them she desired a church built in her honor on a particular site. She added a name by which it was to be called and promised personal favor in life to one of the messengers, while she healed the other of an illness. The messenger apparently testified that the visible picture which he brought was a faithful representation of her whom he had seen, but even this is not set down in the account given. No reason for the erection of the church was intimated beyond the will of the Blessed Virgin. No promise attached to it beyond personal protection to the messenger. All the rest was left to the inferences that might be drawn by reason under guidance of faith from the material token from heaven. What those inferences ought to be history helps to ascertain in its own course of events. The fulfillment of the promises made to Juan Diego personally is a secondary fact of the event on which subsequent history can throw light. It is recorded by tradition alone, but in itself has nothing marvelous. It is simply that the Indian led a very good life for seventeen years after the event; that he gave over his cottage and plantation to a relative and lived alone in a cabin near the first shrine, in which he was buried; that he was venerated by the Indians; that he was known as the Pilgrim among them from his fondness for solitude; that he received Communion by special permission three times a week, and that his portrait was preserved on the wall of his cabin from shortly after his death are about all that is told. The universal belief of the Indians at the time that such a life was itself a fulfillment of the promise of heavenly favor is also recorded. It is itself a strange

evidence of the change of ideas and hopes among the Aztec warriors and former cannibals which followed the building of the sanctuary at Tepeyacac demanded by Our Lady through Juan Diego.

The name itself of Guadalupe is unaccountable for on any historic grounds outside the message to the Indian. Why the Blessed Virgin chose the name no explanation was given nor so far has any been attempted by Catholic devotion. That it was her choice is held without doubt, and that there is a reason for that choice, but what the reason may be has not yet appeared. The analogy with the Apocalypse in the Sacred Scriptures suggests itself in this connection as well as the words of Our Lord to His Apostles, "What I now do you know not now, but you shall know hereafter." The name Guadalupe was unknown to the race to which Juan Diego belonged, nor is it connected with Bishop Lumarraga's native place. There is indeed a sanctuary of the Blessed Virgin of that name in Spain, but it is situated in Estramadura, far from the Basque birthplace of the Bishop. It does not appear that the Spanish Guadalupe was much known to any of the conquistadores of Mexico, though the statue of Our Lady and the Divine Child there was an object of veneration and pilgrimage before the discovery of America. Further it has no resemblance whatever to the Mexican picture, which has always been held to typify the Immaculate Conception, not the Divine Maternity. The Mexican name Tepeyacac continued to be given the town till 1563, though the designation of Our Lady of Guadalupe applied to the picture is mentioned by Bernal Diaz, the companion of Cortez. Its origin as told in the oldest account of the apparitions is not unlike the account given by Bernadette at Lourdes of the Lady who called herself "The Immaculate Conception." The Lady who sent Juan Diego with the picture to Lumarraga also visited and healed his uncle, Bernardino. "She told him to publish what he had seen and how he got back his health, and that the most holy picture was to be called Holy Mary of Guadalupe." So it is called ever since.

Don Miguel Canchez, a priest of the Oratory, was the first to print a history of the apparitions, and it bears date 1648. Another, in Mexican, drawn from documents, some of them apparently cotemporaneous with the apparitions, was printed the following year by Father Lasso de la Vega, a chaplain of the shrine and familiar with its history and the native language. It is from the latter that the summary just given has been condensed. De la Vega only edited the work, and the authorship is usually given to Juan Valenano, an Indian magistrate nearly cotemporary with Juan Diego and Lumarraga. That the latter left acts of the events in the Cathedral archives which were in existence between 1602 and 1606 was attested

on authority of the dean of the chapter, quoted by Sanchez, but they had since been lost. Printing was not common in Mexico at the time. The history of Bernal Diaz, though completed in 1568, was only printed in 1621. That the Mexican documents relating to the apparitions, of which ten are enumerated as well known before de la Vega's publication, is not to be wondered at. Father Becerra Tanco, also an Oratorian, published a history of the miraculous origin of the sanctuary in 1666, which was reproduced in Madrid and Seville. It was in connection with an application to the Holy See for a special office of Our Lady of Guadalupe and with a formal investigation of the existing traditions and their evidence which is of the highest weight in the history of Guadalupe. Fathers Sanchez and Tanco both presented themselves before the Commission of Inquiry and testified on oath that they had written only what they had gathered from statements of old persons of good credit who stated the tradition as they wrote it. Father Tanco added that he had seen and examined the documents and pictures of the Indians recording the miracle and had heard the chant in which the facts were embodied at the time of its occurrence, according to old Aztec use. He added that his history was a literal translation from those Mexican documents and pictures.

Twenty-one witnesses were examined at this time on all the points of the traditional history, and their evidence was strikingly similar. Eight natives of the village of Juan Diego and his uncle were among them. Two were of a hundred years, one a hundred and ten and one a hundred and fifteen. No less than ten witnesses deposed to the facts as related to them by actual acquaintances of Juan Diego personally. Eleven of the twenty-one were priests, eight members of different religious orders and all familiar with the shrine and the opinions of the Church on the facts as well as the native traditions. The whole number substantially repeated the same account of the apparitions and the later life and character of the Indian messenger. The accuracy of memory in the older witnesses was carefully tested by interrogations on other events of legal record and the condition and materials of the old church long disappeared. None of them failed in those tests. It was a mass of evidence which would decide any court in a matter of doubted title. It was sufficient for the judgment of so strict a critic as Benedict XIV. when submitted to him. Tradition of such a quality is certainly historical evidence.

The existence and development of the cult of the sacred picture, with the approbation of the successive Bishops of Mexico, is further attested by secular history. Bernal Diaz, whose long life in America included the career of Bishop Lumarraga, mentions in his history

the "Shrine of Guadalupe, which stands in Tepeaquilla, where Sandoval had his quarters when we captured Mexico," and adds: "See what miracles have been worked and are worked there." It may be observed that the old soldier historian was anything but credulous. In the introduction to his history he denounces sarcastically the sham prodigies which some Spanish writers beyond the seas had seen fit to invent in connection with the campaign of Cortez. Archbishop Montufar in 1563 donated a thousand dollars to repairs of the Chapel of Guadalupe. The Viceroy Erinquez in 1575 informed Philip II. that a confraternity had been founded at Guadalupe in consequence of the miraculous cure of a herdsman some years earlier. It numbered in his time four hundred members and two priests were stationed there. The letter of the Viceroy, it may be added, indicated little personal interest in the facts and objected to having a monastery founded near it, as desired by several parties in Mexico.

The historian Sahagun, who wrote at the same time and had been a resident of Mexico since 1529, referred to the sanctuary of Guadalupe in terms which show its widespread popularity. They further indicate a certain jealousy of the natives that implies they were the chief element in its frequenters even with the approbation given it by the Church authorities. After mentioning the former existence of a pagan temple at Tepeyacac, where the Aztec divinity known as "Mother of the Gods" had been worshiped under the name of Tonantzin, he wrote that the natives applied the same term to Our Lady "now that the Church of Guadalupe was founded." For himself, Sahagun disapproved of the custom, as it might cover some worship of the old deity. He added: "The natives come from very far to visit this shrine, as they did to the old one." He thought their devotion open to suspicion on that account, as "there were many churches of Our Lady which they did not go to, while they came from distant parts to this one."

The writer's scruples seem excessive, as the Aztec word complained of meant simply Our Lady, not an objectionable one to Catholic ears. His doubts about the sincerity of the Indian worshipers in the faith was not warranted by subsequent history. They prove at all events the widespread popularity which the devotion to the sacred picture had gained within a few years. Cisneros, another historian of the same century, calls Guadalupe "the oldest sanctuary in Mexico. It is a picture highly venerated and widely visited, which works and has worked many miracles from a time almost that when the land was won."

The extraordinary extension of the Catholic religion among the Mexican natives in the twenty years following 1531 may account

both for Sahagun's suspicions and in a degree for an object of the Blessed Virgin's appearance. In 1540 the Franciscan Motolinia and another priest baptized fourteen thousand two hundred persons in five days, and in 1548 more than four hundred thousand Indians received Confirmation. The Franciscans alone before that year had registered six millions of baptisms. Such an acceptance of the faith by any race was unheard of in history, and learned men like Sahagun might well feel bewildered and doubt its reality. Though not directly connected by any cotemporary with the revelation at Guadalupe, the almost simultaneous conversion of the Aztec race and its devotion to the miraculous picture are clearly told. It seems no presumption to attribute the former to the latter in a very large degree. The material temple erected by Lumarraga in compliance with the request of the Queen of Heaven was a low oratory of adobe forty-two feet square without lime or mortar. Such was the unanimous evidence of the witnesses of 1666. Humanly speaking, it seemed altogether an inadequate object for a supernatural interposition. The conversion of many millions of souls supplies an explanation at least congruous with the facts.

Whether the Europeans stood somewhat aloof from the Indian shrine in the earlier years or not, they fully joined in venerating it before the close of the century. A Spanish nobleman, Villa Seca, built a hospital at Guadalupe in 1566. The Viceroy, Luis Velasco, spent a night there at his second coming to Mexico in 1589, as did his successor six years afterwards. The development of the cult among all classes was specially shown at the inundation of 1629, but thirty years earlier the Chapter of Mexico took on itself the task of replacing the chapel of Lumarraga by a stately stone church. Its foundation was laid in 1609 and it was completed and consecrated in 1622. It was on the site of the present basilica, and its cost, estimated at fifty thousand dollars, made up by public offerings from all classes. Ten years afterwards a house of reception for visitors was added.

The fame of the sanctuary spread widely, not only in Mexico, but also in Spain, after the inundations of 1629-34. Father de la Vega, the publisher of the first printed Mexican history, built a second church between the sites of the first chapel and the cottage of Juan Diego. They had both fallen to ruin, and Father Lasso rebuilt on their sites in stone. The first is the sacristy, the second the baptistery of the existing "Church of the Indians." It was enlarged subsequently to its present dimensions, about ninety feet by twenty-six in width. Father de la Vega also enclosed with a building the well near the church, which the natives regarded as having healing properties, though it is not mentioned in the account of the apparition.

This building has since been replaced by a very beautiful circular chapel known as the "Church of the Well."

The Spanish benefactors, Christobalde Aguirre and Dona Teresa Peregrina, added a fourth to the sanctuaries of Guadalupe in 1660 by building a chapel on the summit of the hill where the Lady first appeared and the flowers sprang up for Juan Diego. It was rebuilt in masonry forty-five years afterwards and is known as the "Church of the Hill." The foundation of the three secondary sanctuaries was thus almost cotemporary with the publication of the first account of the picture and apparitions in Spanish. The cult made progress slowly, but with ever increasing vigor.

A notable proof of it was given in 1666, when the chapters of the Dioceses of Mexico and Puebla ordered the solemn investigation of the history of the apparition already mentioned. It was on petition of one of the canons, Father Francisco Siles, and on its completion the chapters and the Viceroy applied to the Holy See for recognition of the miraculous events. They asked that the 12th of December should be declared a holy day through Mexico and a special office granted for it. The application was sent to Rome by an agent, but his death and that of Father Siles stopped further prosecution of the project at the time. The Mexican devotion to Guadalupe, however, continued to grow, and quite a number of works were published in connection with it during the following generation. The church of 1609 was found too small, and in 1695 a far more magnificent building was begun to replace it. The first church was demolished and the picture transferred for the time to the "Church of the Indians." Two citizens gave eighty thousand dollars towards the work, and the entire cost was reckoned at nearly half a million, all made up by spontaneous offerings. The new church was dedicated in 1709, in the reign of Philip V. and during the war of the Spanish succession. The wealth of decoration lavished on its interior was wonderful. The reliquary of the picture was of solid silver weighing over sixteen hundred pounds and elaborately worked. Its cost alone was nearly eighty thousand dollars. The gifts offered subsequently at the shrine were reckoned in 1792 as weighing thirteen thousand marks, or nearly seven thousand pounds of silver, in the form of lamps, frames, railings and balustrades.

A virulent epidemic, which broke out in Tacuba in 1736 and spread death through the capital the following spring, caused a further development of the veneration for the miraculous picture. The citizens and the Audiencia begged the Archbishop to place the city, by a public solemn act, under the special protection of Our Lady of Guadalupe as patroness. Archbishop Vizarron granted the request, and on the 26th of May, 1737, the population, after a long function

and procession, made a solemn profession of fidelity to the Blessed Virgin under her title of Guadalupe. The epidemic, it is stated, at once slackened in violence and disappeared within a few days. The impression made by the occurrence through Mexico was so strong that during the following few years every diocese followed the example of the capital and placed itself by public acts under the patronage of Our Lady of Guadalupe. She was acclaimed as special protector of Mexico on the 12th of December, 1747, and the Town Council of the capital sent a commission to Rome to obtain confirmation of the patronage and cult from the Congregation of Rites and the establishment of the 12th of December as a national holiday.

The petition, after long investigation, was granted by Benedict XIV. in 1754, and thus the shrine of Guadalupe received final recognition from the Head of the Church two hundred and twenty years after the approbation of Lumarraga as Bishop of Mexico. The whole course of events was in keeping with the established practice of the Church since its first ages.

The identity of procedure on the part of the Church authorities in dealing with the miracle at every stage of its investigation from 1531 to 1894 is most striking. An unknown Indian first tells of a heavenly revelation to the head of the Church in Mexico. He is received with doubt and told to get some sensible evidence of the truth of his statement. The only credulity attributed to Lumarraga on this occasion is a readiness to believe miracles possible, coupled with natural distrust of the evidence of an unknown stranger in such matters. He receives a material testimony to the fact and accepts it as true in his own judgment. He gives that belief the public sanction of his position as a teacher in the Church, and that sanction is generally accepted as reasonable by the population around of both races. They have the material evidence that convinced the Bishop under their own eyes as a motive of belief. Critics like the Viceroy Enriquez and Father Sahagun see the facts and find no ground to dispute them, but they have a certain general distrust of Indian human nature, and don't like to encourage the new devotion, which after all they think is not a necessary thing for Catholics. The public mind of the community takes a different view altogether. If the Blessed Virgin has really shown herself in their country and requested certain honors, the Mexican Catholics feel and believe those honors ought to be given, and they give them, on the assurance of successive Bishops and Archbishops that there is no un-Catholic superstition in so doing. Minds formed on Christian principles naturally desire ever increasing knowledge of the unseen world and accept particular parts of it as a direct benefit, not an intellectual burden. The question with them is not whether the teaching Church

orders them to profess their belief, but whether she allows them as reasonable men to believe what their private judgment suggests as true.

The investigation held by the diocesan authorities in 1666 is marked by the same spirit as Lumarraga's action towards the first revelation. The witnesses were held strictly to the few leading facts, and their personal knowledge tested under solemn appeal to their truthfulness and accuracy. Tradition, documents, monuments and the existing facts are separately consulted, and the commission then sent its findings to the highest tribunal of the Church and asked its sanction to the existing belief among Mexican Catholics and to form of its expression adopted by them. The Holy See received the application in the same spirit of caution and pronounced no decision either way. The devotion continued to grow in strength for eighty years more and received confirmations by new circumstances regarded themselves as supernatural by the Mexican people. A second application is made to Rome under another Pope and in an age of critical investigation and growing incredulity in Europe. The tradition is then pronounced highly probable at least and the devotion arising from it entirely Christian. Benedict XIV. grants a new festival and office to the Mexican Church and authorizes the name of Guadalupe in connection with Our Lady as special patroness of Mexico. He imposes no new belief on Catholics, but simply sanctions one already existing.

The latest application to the Holy See by the Mexican Bishops on the subject was made to Leo XIII. in 1890 and granted after three years' investigation. Its subject matter may seem unintelligible to many outside the Catholic Church, but is a peculiar evidence of the minuteness of verification practised in its judgments on particular revelations. The request of the Bishops was mainly that in the office of the festival the judgment of the Holy See on the reality of the apparitions should be expressed more strongly. The first office recited that "Our Lady is said (fertur) to have appeared to Juan Diego." That of Leo XIII. puts it: "Our Lady, according to ancient and constant tradition, appeared to Juan Diego." The mental temper which lays such value on increased definiteness of expression, even to so apparently small an extent, certainly is not one of self-confident credulity. It finds parallels in that of the Christian body in the fourth, fifth and sixteenth centuries on the definitions of Consubstantiality, Dual Nature and Transubstantiation. The whole history of the apparitions and devotion at Guadalupe offers a strange parallel to the developments of doctrine and ritual of the Church at large.

The innate vigor of the cult continued to show itself in its own

land all through the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries. It found expression in material works as well as in public worship and pilgrimages. The Church had been made a parochial one in the seventeenth century, but the devotion of the people desired it a higher rank, and in 1709 Don Andres Palencia bequeathed a large fortune for the endowment of a collegiate chapter in connection with it. Many years passed before the needed bulls and other faculties were obtained, but in the middle of the century the collegiate chapter was formally inaugurated. It consisted of an abbot, ten canons, six choir assistants, six chaplains, two sacristans and a staff of musicians and acolytes. Provision for support of all was made by the generosity of the founder, whose bequest amounted to five hundred and twenty-six thousand dollars, a larger sum than that expended on the church building. The succession of abbots and chapter has continued undisturbed since through all the revolutions and changes of government of the land. The sixteenth, Abbot Don Plancarte, was the agent in obtaining the new office from Leo XIII. It may be remarked that all the abbots except two were natives of Mexico. One of the two, Dr. Conejares, was elected in 1851 and received the additional dignity of the mitre. National jealousies have been singularly absent from the Guadalupe devotion all through its history.

A convent of Franciscan nuns (Capuchins) joined to the sanctuary was the next addition after the foundation of the chapter. It was begun in 1780 and completed in 1787 under the reign of Charles III. The buildings, like all the others at Guadalupe, were erected by free gifts, alms as the Spanish term goes. Their cost was two hundred and twelve thousand dollars. The picture of Guadalupe has been three times transferred to the chapel of the convent adjoining during repairs in the basilica. The community still maintains its existence, though within recent years the convent buildings have been appropriated by the Liberal Government. They are now used for school purposes.

The basilica was somewhat injured by the construction of the convent and a proposition was made to rebuild it in 1792. The work was not carried out, however, but in 1802 a general remodeling of the interior and the construction of a new altar was begun. The works were suspended during the rebellion of Hidalgo and only completed in 1836 at a total cost of over three hundred thousand dollars. The beautiful "Church of the Well" was rebuilt at an expense of fifty thousand during the erection of the convent. A peculiar mark of public reverence was attached to Guadalupe after the middle of the eighteenth century by the Spanish Viceroys. They received possession of their office in its sanctuary. The practice began with the first Marquis Revillagigedo and continued till the close of the

Spanish dominion. The universality of the devotion to the shrine by all classes in Mexico—clergy, religious orders and laity, Indians and Spaniards, rich and poor, officials and general public—is as remarkable as its spontaneity in each and the absence of any attempt to make it subservient specially to any one.

The general feeling thus marked showed in strange form during the Revolution. Hidalgo, the leader of the first insurrection in 1810, took a picture of Our Lady of Guadalupe from the Church of the Indians to serve as his standard. Iturbide, the Royalist general who effected the separation of Mexico from Spain, founded a Mexican Order of Knighthood under the title of Guadalupe in 1822, and the Republican President Santa Anna restored it in 1853. The rival candidates for the Presidency made their peace at the sanctuary in 1841, and Herrera, after the downfall of Santa Anna, three years later, celebrated his inauguration with a "Te Deum" there. It was visited with devotion by the ill-starred Maximilian and Carlotta in 1864. The troops of Juarez under Porfirio Diaz occupied the collegiate buildings during the campaign of 1867, but there seems no evidence of any injury offered to the sanctuary beyond the record that after the soldiers left a man brought back "a silver wing of St. Michael" purloined by some soldier and repurchased from him at the cost of a "hat worth ten dollars."

Twenty years after that occupation a movement began to add a new decoration to the sanctuary of Guadalupe. This was to have the miraculous picture crowned, that is to say, to have a golden diadem suspended over its top. Archbishop Labastida entered into the project with enthusiasm, though the first suggestion was due to Father Plancarte, the agent of the Mexican Bishops in obtaining the new office at Rome. The approbation of Leo XIII. for the ceremony of coronation was given in 1887, and the steps to carry it out indicate how strong is the devotion to Our Lady of Guadalupe in the present generation. The cost of the crown itself, a matter of thirty thousand dollars, was made up without difficulty, but to place it in a suitable position on the existing altar was not so easy. It was decided to build a new altar, and as the foundations of the sanctuary were somewhat unsafe a complete remodeling of the interior was decided on. The works were begun in 1887 and continued during seven years, in which the miraculous picture occupied its place in the secularized chapel of the Franciscan convent. The new altar with the crypt involved an expenditure of a hundred and fifty thousand dollars, not to speak of the paintings, statuary, stained glass and other works given by the generosity of individuals. So extensive were the changes that little more than the walls of the sanctuary of 1709 remained when the coronation ceremony was performed in

1895. The close of the nineteenth century, like that of its predecessor, has witnessed a complete remodeling of the temple desired by the Blessed Virgin of Lumarraga. The early part of the sixteenth saw the wish fulfilled in an oratory of sun-dried bricks; the beginning of the seventeenth replaced it in a stately stone church, which the popular devotion at its close pronounced too poor for its object and replaced with the basilica whose royal decorations in 1792 still excite surprise by their value. Even then it was felt that more ought to be done, and three hundred thousand dollars were poured into new adornments during the years of national passion and poverty of the insurrection against the old government and the instability of the new. All costs were freely offered by the popular devotion to the special patroness of the Mexican people at Guadalupe. If permanent vigor be the mark of truth in ideas connected with religion, as Gamaliel pronounced to the Sanhedrin at the origin of Christianity itself, then the devotion of Guadalupe bears such marks of truth in its history.

Bryan J. Clinch.

San Francisco, Calif.

---

## "PACATA HIBERNIA."

IT WOULD be interesting to learn how many of the citizens of the United States have ever read the three volumes entitled "Pacata Hibernia, Ireland Appeased and Reduced; or, An Historie of the Late Warres of Ireland," which were printed in London in 1633 by one Robert Milbourne. The publisher of the work was a Thomas Stafford, who in a pompous dedication to King Charles I. and an introduction addressed to the general body of its readers explained its purport and scope. In his address to the King Stafford told His Majesty:

> That which I now in all humilitie present is your Majesties by many titles: First, from the subject matter, being the final dispersion of that cloud of rebellion, which hath so long over that Kingdom of Ireland, which by undoubted title, and lawfull succession is descended to your Majestie, and that performed by the prudent fortitude of the English nation, which your Majestie now so happily governes.[1] Next, from your Majesties late faithful servant, the Earl of Totnes,[2] whose actions are not the least part of the argument of this historie, hee being at that time chiefe Governour of the Province of Mounster, which was the stage whereon the last and greatest scene of that tragedie was acted, and since advanced by your Majesties Royall father and your selfe to many honourable titles and employments of State.

[1] "Your Majestie" was already engaged in the conflicts and troubles which were destined eventually to cost him his life and throne.

[2] Sir George Carew, created Earl of Totnes.

In his address to his readers Stafford proceeded to account for the great delay which had occurred in the publication of a narrative which had been prepared "thirty years and upwards previously." He recalled that "it was composed while the actions were fresh in the memories of men, but the direction and appointment of the Right Hon. Earl of Totnes—late deceased—then Lord President of Munster." According to Stafford, the "retired modesty" of the bloodthirsty and unscrupulous Carew had induced him to hold it back "from the stage of publication, lest himself being a principal actor in many of the particulars, might be perhaps thought, under the narration of public proceedings, to give vent and utterance to his private merit and services, howsoever justly memorable." Carew, it seems, "leaving the world, left it among his papers," and accordingly it became possible to print the story of his crimes and tyrannies in Ireland.

Now, what lends most interest to the pages of "Pacata Hibernia" is the undoubted fact that it was dictated by Carew himself, and that when we peruse it we are, so to say, listening to that grim old soldier's own words. On the recall of the Earl of Essex, who had failed to achieve the results expected by Elizabeth, the Virgin Queen "being resolved to send a new Lord Deputy into Ireland, made choice of a worthy and noble gentleman endued with excellent parts, as well of body as mind, Sir Charles Blunt, Lord of Mountjoy." Moreover, as "at that time the Presidency of Munster was void by the unfortunate death of Sir Thomas Norris, lately slain by the rebels, she made election of Sir George Carew, Knight, who was by his former services experienced in the Irish wars, to be the Lord President of that province." All this, be it noted, was set down by direction of the personage of "retired modesty," who sought duly posthumous honor. It appears that Mountjoy and Carew embarked at Beaumaris, in Wales, on the 23d of February, 1599, and on the following day arrived at Howth, the bold headland which forms one side of the noble Bay of Dublin. Fatigued as the two worthies must have been by a voyage which is occasionally not wholly free from discomfort when it is made nowadays in one of the mail steamers of the Dublin Steam Packet Company—which convey passengers from Kingstown to Holyhead and *vice versa,* in the worst weather in something between three and four hours—they were compelled to lie up for the night "at the Lord of Howth's house."[3] The next day the pair "rode to Dublin," where they found a distracted Privy Council, confronted by "a miserable torn state,

[3] Howth Castle, still the residence of the descendants of the nobleman named. The splendid old mansion and its grounds are freely open to visitors.

utterly ruined by the war, and the rebels swollen with pride by reason of their manifest victories which almost in all encounters they had lately obtained." Much, as he alleges, against his will, Carew was obliged to make a long stay in Dublin. He had to wait, for one thing, for the arrival of the 3,000 foot soldiers and 250 horsemen who were to accompany him into Munster. Moreover, his colleague had to get various patents and authorities passed under the great seal of the Irish Privy Council, constituting a special council for the better government of Munster, and conferring on Carew authority to exercise martial law whenever and wherever he deemed "meer necessity shall require." It was furthermore ordained that it should be lawful for Carew and his council, "or any two of them, whereof the Lord President to be one, to prosecute and oppress any rebel, or rebels, with sword and with fire, and for the doing of the same to levy in warlike manner and array, and with the same to march, such and so many of the Queen's subjects as to his discretion shall seem convenient."

The commission issued to Carew and the newly formed Munster Council, which was in reality created mainly for the purpose of registering his edicts and thus giving them some kind of formal sanction, conferred on the Lord President practically arbitrary power whenever and wherever he might find himself in a position to exercise. His authority was not confined to the temporal domain, because he was enjoined to look sharply after matters of spiritual moment. One of the many clauses of the commission ran as follows:

> Also, we the said Lord Deputy (Mountjoy) and Council, do earnestly require, and straightly charge the said Lord President (Carew) and Council, that they at all times, and in all places, where any great assembly shall be made before them, do persuade the people by all good means and ways to them seemingly good, and especially by their own examples, in observing all orders for Divine service, and other things appertaining to Christian religion, and to embrace, follow, and devoutly observe the order and service of the Church, established in this realm by Parliament, or otherwayes by lawful authority, and earnestly to call upon and admonish all Bishops and Ordinaries, within the precinct of their commission, diligently, fervently, and often to do the same.

The first chapter of Carew's memoir of his services describes how, shortly before the landing of himself and Mountjoy, the "arch-traitor Tyrone, to unite the rebels of Munster, and especially to confer with James Fitz-Thomas, the titular Earl of Desmond, and Florence MacCarthy," made a journey into the province named. The perfidious White Knight, who had entered into treaty with the English, and his son-in-law, Donagh MacCormac Carthy, had been made prisoner by O'Neill and borne away "in hand-locks," while he had restored Florence MacCarthy to the enjoyment of his rightful rank as the MacCarthy More. Furthermore, he had made war upon the Lord Barry, who had become a Protestant, and despoiled his terri-

tories, adding insult to injury by addressing to that recreant a letter, a portion of which may be quoted:

> My Lord Barry, your impiety to God, cruelty to your soul and body, tyranny and ingratitude both to your followers and country are inexcusable and intolerable. You separated yourself from the unity of Christ's mystical Body, the Catholic Church. You know the sword of extirpation hangeth over your head, as well as ours, if things fall out other ways than well; you are the cause, why all the nobility of the South—from the East part to the West—you being linked unto each one of them, either in affinity or consanguinity, are not linked together to shake off the cruel yoke of heresy and tyranny, with which our souls and bodies are oppressed.

Therefore, O'Neill abjured Lord Barry to "enter into the closet of your own conscience," and having pondered well on his ill-doing, to retrace his steps both politically and religiously. Carew sets out O'Neill's letter in full and also Barry's reply, in which the latter declared his conviction that:

> By the law of God and His true religion (the Protestant) I am bound to hold with Her Majesty. Her Highness hath never restrained me for matters of religion, and as I have felt Her Majesty's indifference and clemency therein, I have not spared to relieve poor Catholics with dutiful succor, which well considered, may assure any well disposed mind, that if duty had not—as it does—yet kindness and courtesy should bind me to remember, and to requite to my power, the benefits by me received from Her Majesty.

Barry went on to remind O'Neill that he held his lands only by security of a grant from the English Crown, and to require him to make restitution of the "four thousand kine and three thousand mares and garrons" which he had carried off as spoil of war or for the service of his soldiers. The letter was dated "At Barry Court, this 26th February, 1599." Tyrone was, unfortunately, compelled about this time to return to Ulster in order to defend his own patrimony against the impending advance of the forces sent by Mountjoy. Before his withdrawal, however, he was successful in drawing into an ambush of his "hell-hounds"—as Carew styles them—a considerable body of the English garrison of Cork. In the action which followed Sir Warham St. Ledger and Sir Henry Power, the leaders of the English force, were killed.

It was not until the 7th of April, 1600, that Carew was able to leave Dublin to commence his operations in Munster. He was accompanied by the Earl of Thomond, Lord Audley, Captain Roger Harvey, Captain Thomas Browne, Captain Garret Dillon and some other captains "and gentlemen," with 700 foot and 100 horse. He was accompanied by the Lord Deputy and some members of the Privy Council "two miles out of the town," reaching Naas the same night. The next day he marched to Carlow and on the third he reached Kilkenny, where he at once paid his respects to the Earl of Ormond, whom he found full of importance over the parley which he had arranged to hold the next day with Rory O'Moore at a spot some eight miles beyond the city. This parley had an ill ending

for Ormond. The Earl of Thomond, who with Carew accompanied him to the place of meeting, set out what occurred in an official report to the latter. It seems that Ormond brought with him a comparatively small escort, and that in his train were several "lawyers, merchants and others upon hackneys." Rory O'Moore, on the contrary, had a large body of his followers in attendance. Whether he intended treachery or not is quite impossible to decide from Thomond's description of what occurred, but it seems not unlikely that the conflict which arose and which resulted in the capture of Ormond was the outcome of some insult offered to Father Archer, S. J., who was in O'Moore's camp. Thomond's story ran in part as follows:

> After an hour or more was idly spent, and nothing concluded, we and others did pray his Lordship (Ormond) to depart. But he desirous to see that infamous Jesuit, Archer, [Father James Archer, one of the most courageous and persistent of the many brave priests who, in the midst of innumerable perils and privations, long strove to maintain the spirit of hostility to Protestant domination amongst the masses of the people and to secure that united action among their chiefs and leaders which would aid in securing the success of a Spanish invasion. To describe such a man as a "traitor" was, of course, grotesque. The avowed policy of Elizabeth and her lieutenants was to banish the Catholic religion from the land, and the only possible means in the circumstances of the time whereby such design would be defeated was by armed resistance.] did cause him to be sent for; as soon as he came, the Earl and he fell into an argument, wherein he called the Jesuit a traitor, and reprooved him for sending, under pretext of religion, Her Majesty's subjects into rebellion.

During this disputation O'Moore's men had been closing round and mingling with Ormond's followers. Suddenly contention arose. Thomond appears to have done his best to save Ormond, but was compelled to make his own escape by riding down those who opposed his passage. Carew himself was actually seized by O'Moore, but some of his friends coming between he was enabled to secure safety by flight. Carew's despatch, covering Thomond's report, was sent from Waterford on the 18th of April, 1600.

Passing over some very graphic descriptions of various minor conflicts between isolated parties of Carew's men and some of the Irish, we find the Lord President recording his arrival at Cork on the 26th of April, the previous night having been spent at Lord Barry's house on the way from Youghal. The "Pacata Hibernia" also contains a number of entries recording the successful accomplishment of destructive raids by the native leaders, almost similar to those with which the recent war in South Africa made the whole world familiar. Carew, however, like Lord Roberts and Lord Kitchener—in the latter case—knew the actual importance of such forays as compared with the fulfillment of the definite plan of campaign he had marked out for himself. They were annoying, but after all only a case of the fly tickling the lion's ear. On the 7th of June Carew received intelligence from himself of the release of

Ormond by Rory O'Moore on the payment of a ransom of £3,000. Having regard to the value of money at the time as compared with our own, the sum was an enormous one. During the months which followed the Lord President was busily engaged in reducing the castles and other strong places in the possession of the so-called rebels, and as his soldiers were fairly well equipped with artillery, while the Irish possessed practically none, he was almost always successful in his operations. In nearly every case such of the defenders as were captured were put to the sword, but in many instances Carew claims to have spared the women and children. What became of them, however, he omits to state. That their fate must have been deplorable is quite certain, because wherever the English forces passed they killed all the natives whom they met and left the country in the condition of a desert. Carew's main purpose was to capture the Earl of Desmond, whom his lieutenants persistently pursued. Somehow or other he got possession of a letter written by "the Spanish Archbishop of Dublin"[4] to the Earl. This ran as follows:

My most honorable good Lord, having long desired a fit opportunity to write unto you, the same is now offered by Mr. John [the Earl's brother], whereof I am very glad, and that by such a most sure and faithful messenger I might open my mind to your Lordship; as also to show that most certain and undoubted hope of aid is shortly to come. I would most willingly have come unto your Lordship's presence, which lately I have essayed, and doubtless would have done, unless I had not been hindered by these Lords, who told me that present and imminent dangers were to be feared in my journey, unless I had an array of soldiers to conduct me; and now—but that there is a necessity of my returning into Spain—I would have come to you in the company of Master John. But I hope that most speedily and most fortunately I shall return unto you again. In the mean time I have pretermitted nothing which might tend to your profit, as well to our Catholic Master, as any other whosoever, which now also in Spain I will perform. I would, therefore, entreat your Excellency, that you would be of good courage, together with all others of your faction; and that you would fight constantly and valiantly for the faith and liberty of your country, knowing and firmly hoping, that the help of my Lord, the Catholic King, is now coming, which when it cometh, all things shall be prosperous, and will place you in your formet liberty and security, that you may possess your desired place and tranquility. The Almighty conserve your Lordship in safety long to continue. From Donegal, 13th February, 1601.

At this time the Earl of Desmond was a hunted, houseless fugitive, seeking safety in the bogs and woods of Kerry. The letter just

[4] Dom Matheo de Oviedo was born in Segovia and was educated at Salamanca. He joined the Franciscan order at an early age, and became prior of the monastery at Toro, in the Diocese of Zamora, in old Castile. He was appointed Archbishop of Dublin in 1600. The selection can only be justified on the ground that there were fair hopes of a Spanish conquest of Ireland. It is not likely that Dom Matheo ever entered his see, which in his absence was ruled by a vicar general appointed by the Pope, Father Robert Lalor. Oviedo escaped to Spain, where he remained until his death in 1609, supported by a pension granted him by King Philip. In 1611 the Pope gave Dublin another Archbishop in the person of Dr. Eugene Matthews, an Irishman, who maintained existence within his episcopal territory for several years, but was eventually compelled to seek refuge in the Netherlands, where he died in 1623.

quoted was in itself sufficient intimation to Carew that the Spaniards intended to attempt the invasion of Ireland, and he, naturally enough, lost no time in conveying the intelligence of the fact to Mountjoy in Dublin and his friend Cecil, Lord Burghley, in London.

On the 20th of September, 1601, "towards night, the Sovereign of Kinsale[5] sent a messenger to Sir Charles Wilmot, then in Cork, with letters importing that there was a fleet of five-and-forty ships discovered from the Old Head of Kinsale, and that they were past the river of Kinsale, bearing towards the harbor of Cork. The inhabitants likewise at Cork harbor brought him word that the said fleet was discovered afore that haven's mouth." Wilmot lost no time in communicating with Carew, who immediately proceeded to assemble all his available forces at Cork. Meantime the Spaniards had withdrawn their ships from the cove of Cork, now styled Queenstown, and reappeared off Kinsale. Hearing this, Carew sent orders to the small English garrison of the latter place to evacuate it. On the 23d of September "the enemy landed their forces in the Haven of Kinsale and marched with five-and-twenty colours (standards) towards the town. Upon their approach the townsmen, not being able to make resistance—if they had been willing thereunto—set open their gates and permitted them without impeachment or contradiction to enter the town. The Sovereign with his white rod in his hand, going to billet and ease them in several houses more ready than if they had been the Queen's forces." Immediately after landing the Spanish commander, Don Juan de Aquila, published the following proclamation:

> We, Don Juan de Aquila, General of the Army of Philip, King of Spain, by these presents do promise that all the inhabitants of the town of Kinsale shall receive no injury by any of our retinue, but rather shall be used as our brethren and friends, and that it shall be lawful for any of the inhabitants that list to transport (*i. e.*, to remove) without molestation in body or goods, and as much as shall remain, likewise without any hurt.
>
> JUAN DE AQUILA.

It will be seen that the Spanish general desired to treat the English settlers and sympathizers in Kinsale with the utmost consideration and courtesy.

Carew quotes a Spanish description of what happened shortly after the arrival of Don Juan at Kinsale. This document appears to have been in the nature of an official publication explanatory of the proceedings of the Spanish commander. It fixes the 1st of October as the precise date of his landing, and it describes the retirement of the small English garrison—fifty foot and forty—"the persons of better sort going with them." Don Juan occupied the town with as little delay as possible, but he found that it contained so few houses his own men were exposed to much discomfort. Moreover,

[5] A title equivalent to that of Mayor or Baillie.

it was wholly unfortified and surrounded by hills which rendered it incapable of defense, unless these could be occupied. The Spanish military arrangements seem to have been as bad as Spanish military arrangements have generally been. The invaders could only land to field pieces and two demi-cannon, "leaving the rest of their artillery unlanded, not having munition sufficient for so much artillery." Moreover, according to the statement, "the powder and match was little and the greater quantity came wet." It was with such equipment King Philip sent poor Don Juan to achieve the conquest of Ireland! The only course open to the Spanish leader was to send back some of his ships to his own country to obtain additional supplies. He occupied the small castle of Rincorran, near the town, and erected something of the nature of earthworks. On the other side, Mountjoy hastened from Dublin to join Carew, and energetic action was taken to secure the speediest possible concentration of all the available English forces against Kinsale. Two Frenchmen who deserted from the Spaniards gave the total number of those landed as 3,500, adding, however, that reinforcements were expected. The force collected by the Lord Deputy and the Lord President was one far superior to that at the disposal of Don Juan, while English ships cruised off the entrance to the port, effectually blockading it. The Spaniards were in a trap of their own making. The English also had Irish allies, because "Cormac MacDermond, chief lord of a country called Muskery," brought all his clansmen to their aid. A comparatively brief bombardment of the castle of Rincorran compelled its garrison to surrender. The Spaniards were sent as prisoners of war to Cork, but all the Irish found within its walls were put to the sword. Meantime the main body of invaders held the fortifications which they had hastily constructed round the town.

Receiving tiding of what was going on at Ulster, Earls Tyrone and O'Donnell proceeded to march into Ulster with a view to assisting the Spaniards by compelling the diversion of a portion of the English force. So large, however, was the number of men at the disposal of Carew and Mountjoy that this movement came to nothing. Carew marched against the Earles, while Mountjoy closed the toils still tighter round the Spaniards. Ships of war were hurried from England, and coming into the harbor of Kinsale bombarded the place and its entrenchments. Moreover, thousands of soldiers were hastily transported from the English ports lying nearest to Ireland, and these were soon at the disposal of the Lord Deputy and the Lord President. All the time, however, the Spaniards demeaned themselves as brave men and held out stoutly. A few amongst them, nevertheless, proved recreants and deserted to the English, conveying valuable information as to the condition of their hard-pressed comrades, who were exposed both day and night to the fire of the

English guns. The result of the conflict was never for a moment in doubt, but assurance was rendered doubly sure by the fact that Carew and Mountjoy were enabled to detach a force sufficiently large to avoid all chance of the Ulster Earls being able to relieve the Spaniards. Suddenly, however, a new element of hope appeared. Six Spanish galleons, carrying 700 soldiers, with goodly store of arms and munitions at Castlehaven, and with these O'Donnell was able to join hands. To the camp of the united Irish and Spanish forces speedily flocked most of the principal Catholic chiefs and nobles of Cork and Kerry. Nearly all these were enrolled as officers in the pay of the King of Spain and granted command of certain companies of foot and horse. Most of them who owned castles in proximity to the coast or to the camp placed these under Spanish control. The English ships, however, assailed those of the Spaniards and speedily destroyed them. Finding his own position growing daily more and more precarious, Don Juan de Aquila despatched an urgent appeal, on the 28th of December, 1601, to Tyrone and O'Donnell begging them to take active measures to ensure his relief. The letter concluded: "Though you are not well prepared, yet I beseech your Excellencies to hasten towards the enemy, for it imports much. I think it needful to be all at once on horseback (*i. e.*, they should mount and ride forthwith); the greater haste you make it is so much the better." Nothing short of a miracle could save the Spaniards, and no miracle worked.

Carew was very indefinite as regards the dates in his narrative, but so far as the context in the original enables judgment the 21st of December, 1601, witnessed fresh developments in the beleaguerment of the Spanish garrison. We are told that:

> This morning being fair, the ordnance played oftener, and broke down a good part of the wall; and to the shot we might proceed the more roundly if Tyrone's force came not the sooner upon us—another great trench was made beneath the platform [a wooden structure on which the English cannon were mounted]; to hinder which the enemies made many shot, but all would not serve: for by the next morning that work was brought to a good perfection, though the night fell out stormy, with great abundance of thunder and lightning, to the wonder of all men, considering the season of the year. This night came certain intelligence that Tyrone would be the next night within a mile and a half of us.

The estimate, however, fell short of the mark, because "towards night Tyrone showed himself with the most part of his horse and foot upon a hill between our camp and Cork about a mile from us, and on the other side of the hill encamped that night, where he had a fastness of wood and water." Tyrone was accompanied by many Ulster chieftains and had with him almost all the Spaniards who had landed at Castlehaven. Amongst his officers, however, was a traitor, one Brien MacHugh Oge MacMahon. It appears that a son of this man had served as a page in Carew's household in Eng-

land, and the father, relying on this fact, sent a message to the Lord President by a ragged little peasant boy begging the gift of a flaggon of aquavitae, or whisky. Carew granted the request with a courteous verbal reply. In return the bibulous MacMahon sent information regarding Tyrone's plans and as to his intention to attack the English camp on the following night. This scoundrel had taken part in the council of war at which the scheme of operations had been settled. The result was that Mountjoy and Carew were able to make preparations which enabled the complete defeat of the combined Irish and Spanish forces. According to Carew, the Irish had 1,200 killed and 800 wounded, most of them mortally. The Spaniards taken prisoners were granted quarter, but their allies were brutally massacred. We are told that:

> The Earl of Clanricarde had many fair escapes, being shot through his garments, and no man did bloddy his sword more than his Lordship did that day, and would not suffer any man to take any of the Irish prisoners, but bade them kill the rebels . . . There were some of the Irish taken prisoners that offered great ransoms, but presently, upon their bringing to the camp, they were hanged.

The Spaniards and Irish shut up in Kinsale made several gallant sorties, entering the English entrenchments at many points, but the relatively enormous force at the disposal of Mountjoy enabled him to drive them back within their own poor fortifications. The success of Carew in destroying most of the relieving army and in compelling its remnant to retreat was complete. The toils were closing fast round the doomed garrison.

On the 31st of December, 1600, the condition of the Spanish and Irish garrison of Kinsale had become so straitened, the port being blockaded by the English ships and the town and fortifications exposed to artillery fire from places of vantage on land. Don Juan beat a parley. He sent out a drum major and an officer bearing a flag of truce. The latter carried also a sealed letter addressed to the Lord Deputy. This missive, according to Carew's narrative, requested that "some gentlemen of special trust and sufficiency might be sent into the town from His Lordship (Mountjoy) to confer with him, whom he would acquaint with such conditions as he stood upon." Mountjoy was fully alive to the advantage derivable from putting an end to the Spanish lodgment on the coast of Ireland, which, however ineffective in itself, afforded secure landing places for reinforcements from Spain should the blundering King Philip decide to send them. The truth appears to be that the Spanish monarch had entirely misconstrued the position of affairs in Ireland. If his soldiers had been landed in Ulster, where O'Neill and O'Donnell were still comparatively powerful, things might have gone very differently from that in which they actually ran. The mere fact

that the Northern Earls had been able to organize a considerable force in Ulster wherewith to march into Munster in itself attests their military capacity and strength. It is, however, pretty obvious that their army, such as it was, must have been largely supported by forced contributions of cattle and produce, levied off the very people whose liberation from English and Protestant domination it came to aid. There is, consequently, some ground for assuming that the unfortunate population of Munster, ground as they were between the upper and nether millstone, displayed slight enthusiasm in support of a plan of campaign which made their possessions the spoil of war.

Mountjoy on receiving the message from Don Juan decided to send one of his chief lieutenants, Sir William Godolphin, into the town to ascertain the condition of the garrison. If Carew is to be trusted, the Spanish commander proceeded to lavish compliments on the Lord Deputy and the English troops, while he was equally liberal in his denunciation of the Irish. According to the same authority, "he was so far in his affection reconciled to the one and distasted with the other as did invite him to make an overture of such a composition as might be safe and profitable for the State of England with less prejudice to the Crown of Spain, by delivering into the Viceroy's (Mountjoy's) power the town of Kinsale, with all other places in Ireland held by the Spanish, so as they might depart upon honourable terms, fitting such men of war as are not by necessity enforced to receive conditions, but willingly induced for just respects to disengage themselves and to relinquish a people by whom their King and master had been so notoriously abused, if not betrayed." If Don Juan really used the language ascribed to him, it would seem that he was only playing on Mountjoy's well-known savage hatred of the Irish in order to secure the best terms possible for himself and his immediate followers. However this may have been, it is certain that when the Lord Deputy replied refusing to grant conditions of honorable capitulation, unless the Spaniards yielded up their money chest, artillery, ammunition and the Irish serving in their midst, to be dealt with as he might think fit, Don Juan positively refused to surrender. It furthermore appears from the rather confusedly worded summary of the correspondence between the two leaders given by Carew that the total strength of the besieged was only 2,600 men, while that of the English was upwards of 10,000. The latter had, in addition, the advantage of holding a number of positions which commanded the town and its defenses. Regarded impartially, the situation was an utterly hopeless one for Don Juan in the absence of reinforcements from Spain, and in view of the defeat and retreat of O'Donnell and Tyrone.

Carew specifically states that Don Juan relied in particular on this last event as the best gratification of his proposal to capitulate. He lamented that his Irish allies had been "blown asunder into divers parts of the world: O'Donnell into Spain, O'Neill to the furthest part of the North," but he absolutely refused to surrender unless accorded honorable terms and unless the natives serving in his ranks were treated on terms of equality with the Spaniards. Eventually Mountjoy recognized the advantage of acceding to Don Juan's requirements. We are told that "how needful it was to embrace this accord may clearly be seen by whosoever considereth the state of our army, almost utterly tired, how full of danger and difficulty it was to attempt a breach (*i. e.,* to storm) defended by so many hands." Moreover, the English ships lying off the entrance to the port were running short of provisions, while a Spanish fleet carrying reinforcements for the besieged might arrive at any moment. "Furthermore, that which seemed of greatest consequence to induce His Lordship to this agreement was that the Spaniards in Baltimore, Castlehaven and Beerhaven by virtue of this contract were likewise to surrender those places and to depart the country." Consequently, "the Lord Deputy and Council thought it in their wisdom meet to condescend to more indifferent conditions, which, being propounded and agreed upon by Don Juan, were signed and sealed on both parts." The articles of surrender contained the following conditions and statements amongst others:

In the town of Kinsale in the Kingdom of Ireland, the 2d day of the month of January, 1601, between the noble lords, the Lord Mountjoy, Lord Deputy and General in the Kingdom of Ireland, and Don Juan de Aquila, Captain and Campmaster General, and Governor of the Army of his Majesty the King of Spain, the said Lord Deputy being encamped, and besieging the said town and the said Don Juan within it, for just respects, and to avoid shedding of blood, these conditions following were made between the said Lord Generals and their Camps.

First: That the said Don Juan de Aquila shall quit the places which he holds in this Kingdom, as well of the town of Kinsale, as those which are held by the soldiers under his command, in Castlehaven, Baltimore, and the castle of Beerhaven, and other parts, to the said Lord Deputy, or to whom he shall appoint, giving him safe transportation and sufficient for the said people, of ships and victuals, with the which the said Don Juan with them may go for Spain, if he can at one time, if not in two shippings.

Amongst the further articles was that which saved the honor of the Spanish commander and the lives of his Irish soldiers. It ran thus:

For the accomplishing whereof, the Lord Deputy offereth to give free passport to the said Don Juan and his army, as well Spaniards as other natives whatsoever, that are under his command, and that he may depart with all the things he hath, Arms, Munitions, Money, Ensigns displayed, Artillery, and other whatsoever provisions of war and any kind of stuff as well that which is in Castlehaven, as Kinsale and other parts.

As soon as the treaty of surrender had been completed Don Juan appears to have entered into the most friendly relations with Mount-

joy and his colleagues, for Carew goes on to tell how: "The day the articles were signed Don Juan dined with the Lord Deputy and the next day after, the Lord President, having Sir Richard Levison and Sir William Godolphin in his company, went into the town of Kinsale, where he dined with Don Juan." The purpose of this visit was to arrange precise details as regards the amount and nature of the provisions which Mountjoy was to deliver for the sustenance of the Spaniards and their allies. These were agreed upon as follows:

For every week, four days flesh, three days fish.
For every flesh day, Bread, four and twenty ounces for a man, and six of Beef.
For every fish day, four and twenty ounces of Bread, six ounces of Fish, and one ounce of Butter.
For every hundred men, one Pipe of wine, besides water.
For shipping for every three men, two tons and he (Don Juan) to give forty shillings the ton, and his men to be landed at the first port they can touch in Spain.

It will be seen that the Spaniards had to pay the cost of transport to their own country. They had also to pay for the food which Mountjoy undertook to provide. Carew gives the details of the bill they had to discharge on this latter score. The figures read:

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| Biscuit, 186,052 pounds | £2,067 | 4 | 8 |
| Butter, 6,304 pounds | 157 | 12 | 3 |
| Flesh, 47,394 pounds | 789 | 18 | 0 |
| Fish, 18,339 pounds | 305 | 13 | 0 |
| Rice, 1,235 pounds | 30 | 17 | 6 |
| Total | £3,351 | 5 | 5 |

On the 9th of January, 1601, Mountjoy struck his camp before Kinsale, and with Don Juan riding beside him as an honored guest rather than a prisoner, made his way to Cork. The Don was attended by "many Spanish captains," but "the gross of his companies were left in Kinsale." Arrived in the Munster capital, the Lord Deputy "lodged in the Bishop of Cork's house, Don Juan in the city and the President at Shandon Castle." On the day following Mountjoy sent Captain Roger Harvey and Captain George Flower with some soldiers to take over "the Castles of Castlehaven, Donneshed and Donnelong at Baltimore, and Dunboy at Beerhaven in the west, all of which were then in possession of the Spaniards.[6]

"O day,' they cried, "of shame and grief!
Don Juan—curse the coward chief!—
Whom Philip sent to our relief,
Has truckled to the foe,
Has hauled the Spanish colours down,
And rendered, not alone the town
He proudly promised to maintain
'For Christ and for the King of Spain,'
But every rood of land we gave
His dainty troops to guard and save;
Finin O'Driscoll's castles strong
Of Donneshed and Dun-na-long,

[6] T. D. Sullivan, in his widely-known poem, "Dunboy," in which he tells in verse the story now received in prose, thus refers to this incident:

Donagh O'Driscoll's castle, too,
By Castlehaven's waters blue;
All these crafty wretch, Carew,
Will hasten to destroy—
And then the craven, last and worst,
Agreed to yield our foes accurst
Our castle! our Dunboy!
O fatal night! O woeful day!
Our castle tricked and signed away!
Our good cause lost, and lost for aye!"

This was entirely in accordance with the terms of capitulation signed at Kinsale. Flower was, however, granted commission conferring on him "power and authority over the Queen's people and her subjects," by virtue of which he was at liberty "to prosecute with fire and sword all rebels, traitors or other capital offenders, with all their aiders, relievers, maintainers, receivers and abettors or any other offenders whatsoever that are not amenable to Her Majesty's laws or have combined or adhered themselves to any Her Majesty's enemies or to any now in actual rebellion against Her Highness, and to make seizure of all their goods and chattles to Her Majesty's use." The terms of this commission were sufficiently wide. It granted its holder full power to execute martial law wherever he passed, as well as "to go aboard any ship, bark or other vessel that shall be or arrive in those parts and to make search in them for traitors, Jesuits, seminaries, letters or prohibited wares." Flower was to serve both as a priest hunter and a revenue officer! Regarded as a whole, the commission was absolutely opposed to the spirit of the Kinsale agreement.

When the Spaniards first arrived they had obtained possession of the various castles belonging to the Irish chieftains, which Don Juan included in the articles of surrender. In acting as he did, the Spanish commander undoubtedly exceeded his rights. The original owners of the castles had only admitted the foreign garrisons under the conviction that they would defend them to the last extremity. Therefore, when they learned that Don Juan had agreed to surrender their strongholds to the English in order to secure favorable terms for himself, they were naturally filled with resentment. For instance, Sir Finian O'Driscoll actually attacked his own residence at Castlehaven and drove out its Spanish occupiers, whom he completely surprised. These, however, speedily commenced active operations for its recovery and were engaged in mining it at the moment when Captain Harvey and his men arrived in the offing. O'Driscoll, perceiving that he was now completely outnumbered, made terms with the Spaniards and left the building, which the latter in due course surrendered to the English. At Baltimore Harvey obtained possession of the Castle of Donelong from the Spanish Governor, one Andreas de Aervy, and three days later the Castle of Donneshed was, "with Spanish gravity, rendered to Her Majesty's use." The real

trouble began, however, when: "From Baltimore Captain George Flower was shipped in a hoy of one hundred and twenty tons with two companies of two hundred in list (*i. e.*, on the roll), but weak by-pole (*i. e.*, in actual numbers), to receive from the Spaniards the Castle of Dunboy, but do all he could by reason of foul weather and contrary winds he could never, although he was at the mouth of the haven of Beere, recover the land, and so was enforced to return, effecting nothing. In this short navigation fifty of his best soldiers by infection died and but seven of the sailors living." This is Carew's account of what happened, but it is highly probable, insanitary though the state of Flower's wretched craft was, that the English commander obtained some information which led him to conclude that residence on board was more conducive to the preservation of his personal health than attempt to affect a landing, because Dunboy was once more in the hands of its rightful owner, Donal O'Sullivan Bear.[7]

Carew tells us what had occurred. He says: "The composition which Don Juan did make when he surrendered Kinsale did infinitely grieve and offend the Irish and especially those who had voluntarily delivered into his hands their castles, but especially Donal O'Sullivan." It appears that, although the Castle of Dunboy was mainly occupied by a Spanish garrison, O'Sullivan had been wise enough to maintain his own residence therein, as well as a personal guard of his clansmen. Among these, probably selected on that account, were a number of skillful masons. According to Carew, "in the dead of night when the Spaniards were soundly sleeping and the key of the castle in their captain's custody, O'Sullivan caused his men to break a hole in the wall, wherein four score of his men entered, for by appointment he had drawn that night close to the castle Archer, the Jesuit, with another priest, Thomas Fitz Maurice, the Lord of Lixmaw, Donal MacCarthy, Captain Richard Tyrrell and Captain William Burke with a thousand men." Father Archer must have been one of those who came in through the hole in the wall, because "when day appeared" he "prayed the Spanish captain to go with him to O'Sullivan's chamber." The latter informed the surprised Don "that his men were entered the castle, that he meant no personal hurt either unto him or to any of his, and that he would keep the same for the King of Spain's use, and also told him that he had one

[7] O'Sullivan was eventually assassinated at Madrid, where he had found refuge, by an English spy, one John Bath. "He had then," says his nephew in his "Hist. Cath. Hib.," "reached his fifty-seventh year, and was singularly pious, for he heard two, and sometimes three, Masses daily, and was extremely charitable to the poor. In person he was tall, elegant and handsome." In the original the words are "procerus, et elegans statura, vultu pulcher."

thousand men within musket shot of the castle." The poor captain, one Francisco de Saavedra, recognizing that resistance was impossible, promptly agreed to surrender. Some of his followers were, however, made of sterner stuff, and coming together "in fury discharged a few musket shot amongst the Irish and slew three of them and hurt one; but by the mediation of O'Sullivan and Francisco de Saavedra all was pacified, O'Sullivan being very careful that no hurt might be done to the Spaniards." The disturbance once quelled, the Spanish troops were quickly disarmed, but O'Sullivan "kept the captain and a few of the better sort, with three or four gunners, in the nature of prisoners, and the rest he sent to Baltimore to be embarked into Spain. He also seized upon all the Spanish ordnance munitions and victuals which was there in store." Shortly afterwards, however, O'Sullivan turned the Spanish captain out of doors, probably recognizing that he was of small use as a fighting man.

On learning what had happened at Dunboy the wretched Don Juan de Aquila offered to lead his own troops against O'Sullivan if so permitted by Mountjoy, but "the Lord Deputy and the President (Carew), who were anxious to see his heels towards Ireland, wished him not to trouble himself with that business." There is no reason for supposing that the Spaniards had any real stomach for the work he pretended anxiety to undertake. Meantime, O'Sullivan was writing letters to the King of Spain, as well as to his friends, the Earl of Caracena, and Dom Pedro Zubiane, justifying his proceedings and imploring aid. These missives were found on board a Spanish pinnace captured by an English ship. O'Sullivan's letter to King Philip was a crushing indictment of that monarch's worthless officers, who must assuredly have been the forefathers of the warriors who lost Cuba and the Philippines to Spain. He told how he had entrusted Dunboy to Spanish keeping "out of meer love and goodwill," with "my wife, my children, my country, lordships and all my possessions forever." His reward was to find that "against all right and human conscience," Don Juan had "tied himself to deliver my Castle and Haven, the only key of mine inheritance, whereupon the living of many thousand persons doth rest, that live some twenty leagues upon the seacoast, into the hands of my cruel, cursed, misbelieving (*i. e.*, Protestant) enemies." Moreover, O'Sullivan went on to say that he had sent into Spain his son, aged five years, "as a pledge for accomplishing your will," even while he told Philip bluntly that he "feared" what had occurred would "give cause to other men not to trust any Spaniard hereafter with their bodies or goods upon these causes." Well would it have been for Ireland if the year 1602 had witnessed the last attempt on the part of Continental States

to use her shores merely as a point of strategic attack upon England, without any real regard for the interests of her people.

The recovery of Dunboy by O'Sullivan was, of course, a matter of serious importance in the estimation of Carew, inasmuch as so long as he retained it he was able to hold open a gate for a new Spanish invasion. Accordingly, we read in "Pacata Hibernia" that:

> To make trial whether the rebels in the country of Carbery would submit themselves upon the sight of an army, having been lately wasted and spoiled by the garrisons at Baltimore, Castlehaven and Bantry; upon the 9th March —which was the day the Lord Deputy departed from Cork—the President (Carew) directed the Earl of Thomond with 2,500 foot in list—which were by the pole but 1,200 foot, and 50 horse—to march into Carbery and from thence into Beare, there to view in what manner the Castle of Dunboy was fortified, of the incredible strength whereof much was noised.

Carew gave Thomond written instructions as to the manner in which the duty entrusted to him was to be performed. These were lengthy and need not be quoted at length, but some paragraphs almost demand reproduction:

> The service you are to perform is to do all your endeavour to burn the rebels' corn in Carbery, Beare and Bantry, take their cows, and use all hostile prosecution upon the persons of the people (*i. e.*, to massacre), as in such cases of rebellion is accustomed.
>
> When you are in Beare, if you may, without any apparent peril, your lordship shall do well to take a view of the Castle of Dunboy, whereby we may be the better instructed how to proceed for the taking of it, when time convenient shall be afforded.
>
> The capital rebels that are to resist you are O'Sullivan and Tyrrell, your lordship must leave no means unessayed to get them alive or dead; the way—in my judgment—how that service may be effected, I have already made known to your lordship, wherein I pray you to use your best endeavours.

Thomond was soon able to send Carew information which gratified him immensely. "The Earl being gone with his army, marched as far as the Abbey of Bantry, about three score miles from Cork, and there had notice that Donal O'Sullivan Bear and his people, by the advice of two Spaniards, an Italian and a friar called Domnick Collins, did still continue their works about the Castle of Dunboy; the barbican whereof being a stone wall of sixteen feet in height, they faced with sods intermingled with wood and faggots—above four and twenty foot thick—for a defense against cannon; they had also sunk a low platform to plant their ordnance for a counter-battery and left nothing undone either within or without the castle that in their opinions was meet for defense." Carew's story is somewhat confused, but it would appear that Thomond saw enough to enable him to report that if the castle itself were sufficiently bombarded by the English artillery its mouldering walls would soon fall into the barbican, which "was not above six or eight foot distant" therefrom, while they were "exceeding high." All the labor and supposed skill of O'Sullivan's foreign and religious advisers in the art of war had only resulted in the production of a complete death-trap for his gallant clansmen. Carew quickly grasped the situation,

and the moment he received Thomond's despatch reciting the result of his observations promptly made arrangements for the regular investment of Dunboy. Accordingly, we are told that "the President—though feeble and weak in his own estate of health—drew forth of Cork the 23d April, 1602, and encamped that night at Owneboy, being the very place where Tyrone lodged at such time as he received the great overthrow near Kinsale."

The recital proceeds: "The four and twentieth we rose and marched to Timoleague, where the army lodged, and three rebels that were taken and brought before the Lord President were executed." Wherever Carew and his men were able to lay hands on any of the Irish they used "all hostile prosecution upon their persons as in such cases of rebellion is accustomed." In plain words, they murdered and burnt as they passed, reducing the country to a condition of desolation. On the 30th of April the Lord President and his soldiers joined hands with Thomond, and it was possible to commence active operations for the reduction of Dunboy. As a preliminary step, however, marauding parties were sent out in divers directions to gather in supplies for the besieging army:

> The 1st May, Captain Taffe's troop of horse, with certain light foot, were sent from the camp, who returned with 300 cows, many sheep and a great number of garrons they got from the rebels.
>
> The 2d, Captain John Barry brought into the camp 500 cows, 300 sheep, and 300 garrons and had the killing of five rebels; and the same day we procured skirmish in the edge of their fastness with the rebels, but no hurt of our part.

It was not, however, until the 1st of June that Carew deemed it advisable to commence the actual siege of Dunboy. In the interval his numerous lieutenants in Kerry and elsewhere had been busy in the work of devastation and slaying, thus guarding against any possible disturbance of his operations against the castle, once these had been begun. O'Sullivan Bear had entrusted the defense to Richard MacGeoghegan, a loyal and worthy soldier, the story of whose death still lives in grateful Irish memory. It is easy to understand why the chieftain did not remain within the walls of his ancient home. Shut up therein during what promised to be a long siege, he would be powerless to enter upon any active service in the cause of his country or co-religionists; while at large he might be able to organize a force capable of relieving his beleaguered followers. However this may have been, he did not remain within the castle, but removed to the Castle of Ardea, whither he appears to have been accompanied by Father Archer. Father Collins remained at Dunboy.

On the 7th of June Carew commenced active operations for the reduction of the place, and "taking Sir Charles Wilmot and one hundred foot for a guard with him, stole out of the camp and marched

directly to the castle to view it and the grounds adjoining; in doing whereof some small shot was bestowed upon them, but none other hurt done than Sir Charles Wilmot's horse shot in the foot. There they found—contrary to the reports of all men that had seen the same—a fair place of good ground and of capacity sufficient to encamp in, within twelve score (yards?) of the castle, and yet out of the sight of it, by reason of a rising ground interjacent, and also upon the top of a small ascent in the midst of the rocks a fair green plot of ground, not a hundred and forty yards distant from the castle, like unto a natural platform, of a just largeness to plant the artillery upon."

After some days' toil the guns were brought to this place. On the 17th the actual bombardment began, the garrison meantime having attempted some sallies, which were repulsed. The firing opened "about five of the clock in the morning, our battery consisting of one demi-cannon, two whole culverings and one demi-culvering." It continued "without intermission till towards nine in the forenoon, at which time a turret annexed to the castle on the southwest part thereof was beaten down, in which there was a falcon of iron placed upon the top of the vault that continually played at our artillery, which also tumbled down. With the fall of that tower many of the rebels were buried therein. That being ruinated, the ordnance played on the west front of the castle, which by one of the clock in the afternoon was also forced down." All Carew's calculations as to the effect of his guns on the time-worn walls had been fully verified. To all intents and purposes Dunboy was incapable of defense against a force provided with artillery of the kind which he possessed.

Perceiving their desperate position, the garrison "sent out a messenger offering to surrender if they might have their lives and depart with their arms and a pledge given for the assurance thereof." Carew, however, was bent on slaughter, and the unfortunate envoy, having delivered his missive, "the Lord President turned him over to the Marshal (Provost), by whose direction he was executed." The defenders were clearly in sore straits, and, moreover, "the breach being in our appearance assaultable, the Lord President gave commandment to have it entered." Having regard to the small number of the besieged, the storming party which was formed was absolutely overwhelming in force, and no one knew better than Carew that when he rejected the proposals of MacGeoghegan and his followers to surrender the alternative was massacre. As a matter of fact, massacre followed. The Irish and their few Spanish comrades fought valiantly, but the result was never for a moment in doubt, although resistance was continued in various portions of the castle until sunset, when the small surviving remnant of the garrison took

refuge in the vaults. Throughout the fighting the English gave no quarter.

Only seventy-seven men in all found shelter in the vaults, "into which we having no descent but by a straight winding stony stair, they defended the same against us." It was now nearly nine o'clock, a fact made plain by Carew's statement that sunset compelled the cessation of a struggle which had been continuous from a little after one. The weary and wounded men within the cellars offered anew to surrender on terms, but Carew refused to grant them even their lives. Notwithstanding, Father Collins "came forth and rendered himself."[8] After this all the Lord President could do was to establish "strong guards" to make certain that no one emerged from the vaults until the morning enabled the completion of the bloody work he had in hands. At dawn twenty-three of the Irish, with two Spaniards and one Italian, artillerists, surrendered unconditionally to the English, the remainder declaring their intention to blow up the powder magazine and themselves rather than surrender. The story is thus told by Carew:

> Then MacGeoghegan, chief commander of the place, being mortally wounded with divers shot in his body, the rest made choice of one Thomas Taylor, an Englishman's son—the dearest and inwardest man with Tyrrell and married to his niece—to be their chief, who, having nine barrels of powder, drew himself and it into the vault, and there sat down by it with a lighted match in his hand, vowing and protesting to set it on fire and blow up the Castle, himself, and all the rest, except they might have promise of life.

Carew absolutely refused quarter and set his cannoniers to batter down the walls of the castle with a view to covering over the entrance to the vault and thus burying all within alive. This expedient proved too much for the fortitude of the rank and file, who compelled Taylor to yield unconditionally. MacGeoghegan was, however, made of more stern stuff:

> Sir George Thornton, the Serjeant Major, Captain Roger Harvey, Captain Power and others entering the vault to receive them, Captain Power found the said Richard MacGeoghegan lying there mortally wounded and perceiving Taylor and the rest ready to render themselves, raised himself from the ground, snatching a lighted candle and staggering therewith to a barrel of powder—which for that purpose was unheaded—offering to cast it into the same, Captain Power took him in his arms, with intent to make him prisoner, until he was by our men—who perceived his intent—instantly killed and then Taylor and the rest were brought prisoners to the camp.

Within a few hours fifty-eight of the captives were executed, and Carew exultingly records that "the whole number of the ward (*i. e.*, garrison) consisted of 143 selected fighting men, being the best choice of all their forces, of which no one man escaped, but were either

[8] Collins, who was a native of Goughal, before he became a Jesuit "had been brought up in the wars of France, and there under the League had been a commander of horse in Brittany." He probably placed undue reliance on the chivalry of Carew and his colleagues.

slain, executed or buried in the ruins, and so obstinate and resolved a defense had not been seen within this kingdom."

It may be regarded as certain that the surrender of Father Collins before the last extremity was reached was induced by disinclination to incur responsibility for the act of wholesale suicide, the perpetration of which was favored by MacGeoghegan and Taylor, and which would have been, had it been effected, more pagan than Christian. Taylor was eventually hanged at Cork by orders of Carew, and Father Collins at Goughal, "the town in which he was born," because "no penitence appeared for his detestable treasons, nor yet would he endeavour to merit his life, either by discovering the rebels' intentions—which was in his power—or by doing of some service that might deserve favour." Not one of the brave men who held Dunboy for God and Ireland escaped death!

WILLIAM F. DENNEHY.

Dublin, Ireland.

---

## THE CAUSES OF SOUTH AMERICAN SUSPICION.

ONE of the most significant events in our diplomatic world is the despatching of Mr. Root, the State Secretary, on an official tour over and about South America. Not since the time when Congress sent the Franklin mission to Canada, with John Carroll as interpreter and adviser, has any such advance been made to neighboring people. The meaning of the mission is plain enough. Our Southern neighbors have taken the alarm at recent manifestations of an imperialistic spirit, with its conquering impulses, and have formed a coalition for their mutual protection. Our recent action with regard to Colombia and Panama has certainly aroused a suspicion in other Southern peoples with whom we have relations. They look askance at our magniloquent attempts to pose before the world as their protectors against foreign aggression, and they seek other markets than those of the United States for their surplus products.

Our present Minister to Colombia, Mr. John Barrett, who knows much about South American affairs, since he was formerly Minister to Argentina also, has made commendable efforts to ameliorate the condition of feeling between North and South. In order to dispel what he styles "the lamentable ignorance" that prevails in the United States in regard to Central and South America, Mr. Barrett has given prizes for the best essays by college students on the history and economic conditions of Spanish America. This year he offers sim-

ilar prizes to the students of Columbia University. This is a good endeavor, but it would be better still if Mr. Barrett could get the popular magazines and newspapers to inaugurate a crusade of enlightenment to the same end. There are mountains of prejudice to be levelled, and furrows of bigotry of long standing to be filled up. Religious bigotry is the primary cause of the trouble. This nefarious sentiment is kept alive by the zealous fanning of the missionaries who are sent to the South by foolish philanthropists, under the delusion that they may undermine, by persevering patiently at their work, the great fabric of Catholic faith that Spain long ago reared in the South. As long as funds are forthcoming for such a chimera the spirit of prejudice and mutual distrust will be fed, and the efforts of such sensible people as Mr. Barrett must be rendered largely nugatory.

That such a sentiment could carry people who are ordinarily the sanest and most practical into quagmires of credulity, as though led by a Will-o'-the-wisp, would be hardly credible without some specific tangible proof. Such a proof was afforded in Philadelphia a few years ago, when this writer was one of an audience who sat in the auditorium of the Drexel Building listening to a lecture given by an American traveler who had recently returned from Mexico. The lecturer was an intelligent, practical, observant man whose chief aim in visiting the lovely country of the Aztecs was to study its commercial possibilities. But he could not avoid noting the religious situation that confronted him while there, and he noted it with the lens of a magnifying telescope. The effect was wonderful. He calmly assured that audience of well-dressed, well-educated American people that the Mexican peasant is the slave of the priest, who sucks him dry. This is, writing from memory, the substance of what the lecturer said. The extent to which the peasant is habitually squeezed by the priest was indicated by the lecturer thus: Supposing the laborer earned two American dollars a week, he was obliged to hand over one dollar and a half of that amount to the Church! That respectable audience listened to this traveler's tale with perfect credulity and satisfaction, thanking God, no doubt, that they lived in a country where priests had not the power to levy blackmail at their sweet will. Although the outrageous statement was challenged in the Catholic press, almost immediately, the lecturer did not think it necessary to take any notice of the challenge, but went calmly on his way, delivering the same lecture, no doubt, in other cities, and getting handsomely paid for his limelight pictures of Mexico. Possibly he may have been sincere in his description. Some sharp native, finding him credulous and prejudiced, may have made him the victim of a hoax. Such things are happening every day.

Prejudice has a prescriptive title in the United States, in regard, in especial, to those South American countries. The seeds were very early sown. They brought forth that crop of hatred and injustice which led to the Mexican War and the spoliation of California, Texas and New Mexico. Good men and women, no doubt, denounced Presidents Jackson and Polk and the war party in general in good round American invective, but, as usual, the jingo sentiment swept the nation along and injustice carried the day. At any moment Americans of the present day may find themselves in the whirl of a similar vortex by reason of their own ignorance of real conditions and the representations of the missionary agents in various South American countries, who see things only through the missionary eye and are entirely out of harmony or sympathy with a Catholic people of Indian strain, whose traditions, tendencies and temperament are as different from those of the missionaries as the Euphrates is from the St. Lawrence. Our national vanity, or rather massed individualistic conceit, is likewise a dominant factor in the production of a feeling of distrust on the part of the South American people, in our regard. One of the most influential and plain-speaking of our daily papers, the New York *Evening Post,* declared recently that our bad manners and our contemptuous way, our overbearing way, in fact, of dealing with these peoples, is the reason why they prefer to deal with any other people on earth than ourselves. One virile American, it is commonly shown on the stage, is able to knock together the heads of six "dagoes." The *Evening Post* is getting on the scent, but it has not as yet struck it directly. It has missed the religious equation in the problem.

In 1826 there was published in New York a "View of South America and Mexico," by an anonymous author, "A Citizen of the United States," as he modestly signed himself. It gave a condensed history of all the States of South America, but devoted itself chiefly to Mexico, Chili, Brazil, Colombia and Argentina (then called "the United Provinces"). A copy of the book in the writer's possession is embellished with a portrait of Bolivar, the Liberator, and some practical minded youngster prefigured the course of North American chronicle toward the South by tracing over the lineaments of the great patriot with a pen or brush dipped in writing ink. The effect is grotesque. Bolivar has a pair of black eyes, with no whites visible, and a nose all awry, together with an open mouth sans teeth. Nothing could be happier as a practical simile, in miniature, of the process which historians have chosen with regard to the South American people. The process is still in vogue, and it has cost American manufacturers a large amount of hard cash. The merchant and maker pay for the bigot's whistle.

In an introduction to this work, which was intended, as the author explained, more for popular than critical use, he cited a considerable number of authorities, chiefly British and American—Robertson, Morse, Fune, Hall and others—and only one bearing a Spanish name—Pazo. Then making an excuse beforehand for anticipated mistakes, he said that the explanation for such would be that "most of our information is necessarily derived through a foreign language." The unknown author was either disingenuous or did not know how to convey his meaning clearly in the one language with which he possessed an unscholarly acquaintance.

When first the idea of taking interest in the affairs of South America manifested itself in this Republic, a genuine sentiment of republican sympathy seems to have been the motive which gave rise to it. The tyrannical rule of Spain over the South American colonies was universally denounced. But it is a fact suggestive of insincerity with regard to this sentiment that after the South American States had shaken themselves free from the Spanish rule the hostility with which that rule was regarded was transferred in many cases to the people who had emancipated themselves from it. These became, in turn, the objects of the same methods of attack as were employed against the Spaniards. They were constantly held up to the world's scorn as bigoted, superstitious, priest-ridden, lazy, dirty, intolerant and generally decadent. The priests, again, have been the objects of the most unmerciful vilification. Every crime in the calendar has been laid at their doors. To this very hour this unchristian system of calumny is continued. A living example of its activity and venom was afforded in the pages of the New York *Tribune* during the month of March this year. An attempt had been made by four armed men to assassinate General Reyes, the President of Colombia. The *Tribune* immediately published a statement on the subject, based on the word of a Colombian then in New York, declaring without qualification that "it was known" that the Jesuits had hired these assassins to kill the President—why or wherefore it was not thought necessary to say. Then came the news that the assassins had been discovered to be anarchists, and that the whole four had been executed. Again the *Tribune* described them as instruments of Jesuit malignity. What a combination!—Jesuits and anarchists! When absurdity of this kind is found disgracing the pages of a leading organ of public opinion in the very seat of the nation's heart and brain, as New York may be regarded, what may not one be prepared to find in remote parts of the country, where ancient hatreds and superstitions still flourish in much of their pristine rank luxuriance?

While the civil sway of Spain over the countries of South America

was often oppressive and deserving of opprobrium, it was a thousand times more just, humane and enlightened than that of Great Britain over India and Ireland. It was carried on by the Spanish Government in very much the same way as the government of Ireland and India is to this day carried on. Viceroys were appointed by the Crown, and these again appointed deputies in the various provinces. But the system was infinitely better than the British system in the Old World, inasmuch as each province and division enjoyed a practical system of home rule, with an admirable popularly elected judiciary and a system of representation on all matters wherein taxation was involved. No doubt Spanish domination in its earlier stage brought woe and slavery to the aborigines, but the royal power soon put an end to that form of oppression, and the heroic Jesuits and other religious orders soon threw a shield over the Indian and protected him from the cruelty and greed of the hard-hearted conquistador and the commercial Spanish adventurer—the carpetbagger as we style that human pest to-day. In the splendid system of ecclesiastical government established by royal authority in Nicaragua and other places the power of religion to civilize the savage and convert him into one of the most useful of men was demonstrated in a marvelous way. No such experiment had ever been witnessed before, for under no other government but that of Spain could it have been made possible. Yet the anonymous historian who set out to tell the story of the South American Republics ninety years ago gives no credit to Spain for its liberality and wisdom, but compares its colonial policy unfavorably with that of England. The Spanish Monarchy, he stated, was absolute, while that of Great Britain was limited, and this limited condition affected the rule of the colonies as well as the insular government. Theoretically it did, no doubt, until the abolition of the East India Company and the proclamation of the English sovereignty as an imperial and not a kingly one, during the late Queen's reign, at the instigation of the supple Jew, Disraeli, who was bent on carrying out the dream of Vivian Gray and gaining the title he had chosen in the novel, Lord Beaconsfield. Previous to the Indian Mutiny the East India Company ruled India in a fashion so defiant of respect for human right and so cynical in its selfishness and cruelty as to defy all comparison—save perhaps that of the Sultans of Morocco and Zanzibar when the slave trade was the staple source of revenue for the treasury. In India there was a Viceroyalty, as there was in the Spanish colonies; but the Viceroys in India were powerless, in a large measure, before the privileges of the royal charter which the East India Company could flourish in the face of delegated power; while in Ireland the Viceroy was subordinated in authority, by a most paradoxical mal-arrange-

ment of the English Parliament, to his own Chief Secretary, and only served as a mere ornamental figurehead holding a mock court and giving levees and "drawing rooms" on stated occasions, in Dublin Castle.

From the beginning the English-speaking writers of South American history of the type of this unknown one began the work of defaming the Church and the religious orders. A few examples of this spirit and the contradictions in which it often involved the maligners may be offered. Here is a characteristic sample:

"An inconsiderate zeal for the establishment of monasteries was disclosed at an early period, and, from the influence of the regular ecclesiastics, these institutions were multiplied to a pernicious extent, in a new country, where every encouragement ought to have been afforded to the increase of population."

The disingenuousness here is the suppression of the fact that the friars who built and tenanted these monasteries came, as a rule, from Spain, and their presence in the new country in no wise affected the increase or decrease of the population, except in the direction of that improvement in economic conditions which invariably ensues on improvement in moral conditions, such as the monasteries and their spacious settlements speedily brought about in those regions which came within the zone of the Spanish missions.

"Most of the clergy in America were regular, and many of the highest honors and preferments were in their possession. Great numbers of them came as missionaries, and most of them in quest of liberty, wealth or distinction."

How could it be otherwise than that the clergy who came out from Spain should belong to orders? Missionary priests could only be of that class. None of them, it is certainly most safe to say, ever came out " in quest of liberty, wealth or distinction." They came out on the most glorious of missions—namely, to stand between the conquistadore and the bagman and the intended or actual victims of victorious invaders, and to proclaim the inhibition of the Church against oppression of the conquered. They came also to plant the faith of the Cross and to sow the seeds of Christian civilization.

"The success of the missionaries in converting the natives was almost entirely deceptive; they made use of the same unjustifiable means that have been resorted to by the Jesuits in other parts of the world, and with like success. To render the new religion more palatable, and to introduce it with greater facility, they pretended that there was a similarity between the doctrines and mysteries of Christianity and the crued notions of their own barbarous superstitions. By fraud and force, in the course of a few years after the reduction of the Mexican Emipre, more than four millions of the

natives were baptized; but they remained the same, or at least no better, for such spurious conversion. They were not entirely ignorant of the doctrines and duties of Christianity, but retained all their veneration for their ancient superstitions. This mixture of Christianity with their own superstitious rites was transmitted to their posterity and has never been eradicated."

Eighty years ago, as we thus find, the seeds of racial and religious rancor were sedulously planted in the North American mental soil. Long before Prescott and Parkman began their labors in the same invidious field, the ground had been broken and furrowed by the toil of cruder litterateurs, and now we of to-day are reaping the harvest of hate thus carefully provided for.

Comparisons between the respective humanity and motives of British colonization and that of Spain, in such a discussion, is quite natural. Both countries began their colonial career in the same historical era. But they each had different conditions to approach. In the East Indies the English adventurers found an ancient and gorgeous civilization founded on a moral and philosophical system rooted in the dawn of history, and productive of a contentment among the millions of the people that, if it did not signify progress, gave the empire of the Moguls a state of permanent, if stagnant, peace. In South America the Spaniards found the primeval forest and the fierce paganism of the untutored savage, tempered in portions of the new region, as in Mexico, with a bloody and revolting cult akin to that of Moloch. And yet historians of the repute of those named shed literary tears over the overthrow of the "civilization" of the Aztecs and its horrible human holocausts! These and their conquerers of lesser rank would fain impress on the world the idea that while a special Providence guided the prows of English ships toward the Oriental Ind, a curse filled the sails of the Spanish caravels that bore the Spanish Jesuits, Franciscans and Dominicans to South American ports!

As every tree is known by its fruit, the colonizing policy of both Great Britain and Spain is to be judged by the respective results. Here in the North the Anglo-Saxon has left his imprint deep on the page of the aboriginal history. It is a chronicle that brings him no glory. It stamps him as an exterminator and a rapacious coveter and grasper of that which is not his. Spain, on the contrary, has infused her blood and her national traditions into the life of the South American aborigine, and did not proceed to "improve" him, as the English settlers did the Northern aborigine. Yet such a distinction in treatment was held up to Northern admiration, eighty years ago, by a cynical inversion of reasoning, as a circumstance inuring to Spain's discredit and Anglo-Saxon glory! This might

appear a difficult position to advance or maintain, since "facts are stubborn things," and no fact stands out more clearly than the wiping out of the North American Indians and the survival and multiplication of the South American ones. Audacity, however, like necessity, knows no law, as the following passages of the history under consideration will show:

"If the Spaniards rendered little benefit to the natives by their attempts to Christianize them, their conduct towards them in other respects was severe and oppressive in the extreme.

"The views of the Spaniards with respect to the natives were entirely different from those of the English in the American colonies. In the latter the natives were either induced peaceably to cede their lands and retire further into the interior of th continent, or from the successive hostilities which arose were exterminated or dispersed. As the European settlements extended, the natives, who had for ages been 'lords of the soil,' gradually retired, disposed of their lands, or had them wrested from them by war, and sought new abodes, where, depending on the chase, they might enjoy an easy subsistence. They melted away before the sun of civilization like the dew of the morning, without leaving any of their number behind or scarcely" (*sic*) "a trace of their former existence. Not only thousands of individuals, but numerous tribes or nations might say with Logan, the Mingo chief, 'Not a drop of our blood flows in the veins of any living creature inhabiting the land of our fathers.'"

Whatever the wrongs inflicted on the Southern Indians by the early Spanish settlers—and they were many and as long-lived as calamity—they were at length mitigated by the Spanish crown and all attempts to keep the people as serfs by the settlers were in the end frustrated. By the efforts of Las Casas and the religious orders, the Indian was soon placed on a social equality with the conqueror, and no attemptw as made to establish the odious color line. How different their case from that of the North American red men and the English settlers!

Craft and cruelty are charged against the early Spanish conquerors, but these vices were not peculiar to them. They are equally applicable to Warren Hastings as to Pizarro. The Begums of Oule were subjected to them no less than the Incas of Peru. Tortures were resorted to by the English adventurers in the East as well as by the Spaniards, in order to gain possession of the riches of the native princes. They are shown in the wars of conquest of to-day not less than in those of the sixteenth century, with only the difference of degree. The war against the Boers of South Africa was begun in craft and carried out in cruelty on the most colossal scale. Is there any parallel in the Spanish wars of colonization for the

burning of 89,000 farms and the driving of the women and children left homeless into foul camps, to die of disease, hunger and despair? No such record ever before blotted the page of history, and it was not of Spain it was written, but of England—the country whose historians have been holding Spain up before the world as the personification of all that is treacherous and cruel ever since the days of the Tudors.

It was inevitable, from the circumstances under which the Spaniards began the colonization of South America, that abuses should spring up in the beginning. The newcomers were selfish adventurers, just as the newcomers in many other colonies were, and they were not over-scrupulous as to the means by which they attained their selfish ambition. They oppressed the natives and used them as slaves. The British in South Africa have been doing the same in regard to Kaffirs and Chinese, and their High Commissioner, Lord Milner, defended the practice of flogging the Chinese coolies in the mines as necessary. No one in such authority ever attempted to defend cruelty toward South American Indians in so bold a way; and as soon as the Spanish monarchs could they abolished slavery and passed salutary laws to protect the native races. The wise legislation of Charles V. secured the Indians in their rights as free subjects of the Spanish crown; and later on this legislation was supplemented by the action of the Ministry, under Count Galvez, in establishing the system of "intendancies," which put an end to many abuses which had crept in under the older system of "encomiendas" and the worse one of "corregidors"—a system very much akin to that in vogue at the mines here, where the miners buy from agents at an exorbitant price and are driven to borrow money at an exorbitant rate of interest to usurers and blood-suckers.

The readers of those early histories could hardly fail to rise from their perusal without a feeling of loathing toward Spain as a governing country and a still deeper one with regard to the Catholic Church, since every dishonest device is resorted to in order to produce such a sentiment. In this particular case much the same tactics were employed as in the case of the so-called selling of indulgences by Tetzel. Indulgences are understood to be licenses to commit sin, just like a license to sell liquor or gunpowder. Monks are represented as selling the "Bull de Cruzado"—probably the Bull "In Coena Domini," promulgated against the Turks; and the Bull is described as 'granting absolution" for past sins and granting certain dispensations in regard to Lent. Any ordinarily educated writer would not be found committing himself to such a puerility in statement, for the usual law of the Church renders any such interposition unnecessary. Absolution is pronounced by the individual priest on

the acknowledgment of sin, and there is no need of a Papal Bull to ratify it. So, too, with regard to dispensation in the matter of fasting and adstinence. The individual priest possesses the power to deal with all such matters. Yet under a misapprehension of the true nature of such questions, the anonymous writer of this "history" did not hesitate to set down as a statement of fact that by allowing such a practice as the "selling" of these Bulls the Spanish monarchy, which should have been the protector of the morals of the people, bartered them away for the sake of a paltry tax! Even the statement of the accusation proves it to be a stupid falsehood—for how can anything whose payment is optional be called a tax? Little wonder that the American mind, at an early age, became embittered against Spain and the Catholic faith when the process of systematic empoisoning was thus begun in the very infancy, so to speak, of the American Republic.

Historians who sit down to work out a theory conceived in racial prejudice may get along smoothly for some time, but as they proceed they lose hold of the thread which has led them into the labyrinth and presently find themselves floundering. They have proved too much; their vaulting ambition has overleaped itself. This particular chronicle bristles with such contradictions. The careful reader will frequently find that while he was having his mind prepared for some deplorable outcome of unfortunate or intolerable conditions an anti-climax is reached, by some remarkable oversight, and a result very creditable to the ruling power, just before held up to execration as a detestable tyranny, is presented to the reader's gaze, very much to his astonishment. No picture could be darker than that drawn of the condition of the Spanish Creoles, for instance, in the course of this narrative. They are represented as oppressed beyond the power of human endurance, degraded, kept in ignorance, ground down by "foreign" rule—in a word, on a plane with the Irish Catholic people during the penal laws—and yet as a class distinguished for their loyalty and attachment to *their* King and country"—that is to the rule of those who had just been described as "foreign." This spirit of loyalty was strongly in evidence when an abortive insurrection was gotten up in Caraccas, at the instigation of British speculators by a man named Leon, not for political but commercial purposes. The Creoles remained steadfastly loyal, and so checkmated the British friends of liberty, as the conspirators pretended to be. Again their loyalty was put to a stronger test when another conspiracy, headed by Tupac Amru, a descendant of the Incas, broke out in Peru. This was a formidable attempt to restore the power of the Incas, and the struggle lasted for three years. But at length it collapsed, and mainly because of the fidelity of the same

class—the Spanish Creoles. This was in 1781. Yet this same super-faithful race is found, in the same pages, a few years later—namely, in 1797—eagerly joining in another conspiracy, originating also in Caraccas, but fomented from outside. Why such a surprising change in sentiment in so very short a period? What had happened to a people who were so fond of hugging their chains to make them now eager to rend them? Had a new Caractacus, a modern Spartacus, arisen to inflame their sodden spirits and rouse them from the slough of despond? The answer to this inquiry is one of absorbing interest, because it embraces a chapter of history which furnishes the explanation of many events in modern affairs which on the surface look like the incipient struggling of a newborn spirit of freedom, the travail of liberty, but when investigated further indicate the beginnings of a much less noble inpulse—the spirit of commercial aggression and filibustering piracy.

Mr. William Pitt, the great statesman who destroyed the liberty of Ireland, was for a considerable time much perturbed in his mind about the political status of the South American people, and the desire to bring about their emancipation had taken strong possession of him. There happened to be in London just at this period an ex-Jesuit named Guzman, a Peruvian, and with him the British Prime Minister had several conferences, the outcome of which was the publication by Guzman of an appeal to the Peruvians to arise and throw off the Spanish yoke. More than this, funds were sent out by Pitt to General Miranda to enable him to get up a filibustering expedition against Venezuela. Pitt went farther than this. He got the British Minister to make a serious proposal to the United States Government, Mr. Adams then being President, to have a joint intervention over the Spanish colonies and sunder their connection with Spain. Miranda's attempt was made, but with disastrous results, not for himself, but for the dupes whom he had persuaded to embark in it. A number of young men from the United States enlisted in the service, and these were soon overpowered by the Venezuelan forces. They were thrown into prison, while Miranda himself got away in safety.

The real object of Mr. Pitt's emancipation ardor was made apparent by the text of a proclamation published by the Governor of Trinidad, Sir Thomas Picton, throwing open the ports of that island to the trade of the South American colonies and directing the attention of the people to the facilities thus afforded for storing up arms and preparing a *point d' appui* for a descent upon the South American colonies. The proclamation in short was an undisguised attempt to stir up insurrection all over the Spanish colonies in South America, and it made no secret of the motives which inspired the call to free-

dom. It was "to liberate the colonies from the oppressive and tyrannical system which supports with so much rigor the monopoly of commerce" and "to draw the greatest advantages possible which the local situation of the islands presents, by opening a direct communication with the other parts of the world, *without prejudice to the commerce of the British nation.*" It was hardly necessary to italicize this proviso to have its significance comprehended, but it is proper to give it all the emphasis possible, because it reveals the awful hypocrisy which sought under a pretext of love of liberty to destroy the rule of Spain and the commerce of Spain, for the base purpose of securing it for Britain and her own colonies. This is certainly the most flagitious transaction that ever disgraced the foreign policy of any British Minister. Its nefarious character is all the darker because of the record of the Minister who inspired it—the heartless destroyer of Ireland's Parliamentary rights and the cold-blooded author of the sanguinary uprising of 1798—a rebellion which, as the State papers have since proved, was gotten up deliberately by his contrivance in order that he might have the country deprived of the means of resistance while he proceeded to execute the design of destroying her public liberties.

Such was the character of the Minister who desired to be lauded in history as the liberator of the Spanish colonists. We have seen that he had made overtures to Mr. Adams, the President of the United States at that period, with a view to joint action against Spain, but met with no encouragement in that direction. The idea of territorial expansion had not as yet inflamed the minds of statesmen bent more on securing what they had won from despotic power than on reaching out for empire.

A fresh attempt on the Spanish colonies was made in the year 1806. A British expedition, under Sir Henry Popham, entered the river La Plata and made a movement against Buenos Ayres, but after a little while was forced to surrender. Soon afterward Popham, having received reinforcements, was enabled to storm Monte Video. Two other expeditions, under Generals Whitlock and Crawford, were respectively directed against Buenos Ayres and Valparaiso. Both armies joined in the attack on Buenos Ayres, but they were soon put to flight by the brave inhabitants, after having lost fully one-third of their number in the fighting, and the British commanders were very glad to sign an agreement to leave the country within two months. The object of these various attacks was no longer dissembled. It was not to emancipate the colonists, as before pretended, but to subjugate the country and annex it to the British crown, as a state of war then existed between Britain and Spain, as an ally of France, as she at that time was, although destined to

be in a very short time in a life and death struggle with her for national existence.

As long as Spain maintained her sovereignty intact, her South American colonies continued loyal. There were many and grave abuses in their government, but none greater than in the government of other powers in their various colonial systems in other parts of the globe, but the people were, for the most part, prosperous and contented with their condition. But the soil was being prepared for a change. The introduction of Freemasonry was the most active agency. This element recognized its natural enemy in the Church, and to the overthrow of its influence the members of the craft, throughout many of the colonies. directed their efforts and instituted a vigorous propaganda which is carried on unflaggingly still. But the great factor in the separation of the colonies from the mother country was the seizure of the crown of Spain by Bonaparte and the bestowal of it on one of his brothers. This flagitious usurpation shook the colonial system from end to end. The affairs of the various colonies were thrown into the utmost disorder, and the people, led by able and restless spirits, began to devise means whereby their interests might be better safeguarded. One by one they broke away from the connection and, inspired by the example of the United States, they each, in turn, adopted the Republican idea and fashioned their form of commonwealth rule on the famous formula adopted by Jefferson and the other great Republican leaders. The change was not easily effected. The struggle was prolonged and bitter, but in the end the colonies triumphed. Such a result ought naturally, one might think, have won for them the sympathy of the Northern Republic, to which they had paid the delicate flattery of imitating its Constitution, and for a little while it did. But gradually the feeling changed. There were vast territories lying close to the Northern Republic's frontiers—Florida, Louisiana, Texas, New Mexico, California—and on these the eyes of ambition and greed soon became fastened. They were thinly populated, and all but defenseless. Soon excuses for aggression arose, through the disorders inevitable from border laxity and Indian depredations.

Alexander Von Humboldt is an authority not open to the usual objection. A scientific explorer rather than a political observer, his great mind was capable of storing up a multitude of facts and deducing from them their essential meaning and their bearing on the varied phenomena which challenged his attention as he laboriously pursued his scientific investigations. He traveled extensively in South America—more so, perhaps, than any other traveler, save, perhaps, Audubon—and he noted carefully the social and political conditions which resulted from Spain's great colonizing undertak-

ings there. In his book on "New Spain" (Mexico now) he gives a deeply interesting account of the people and their condition. This passage is particularly valuable as an offset to the rancorous misstatements of American historians:

"The Indian cultivator is poor, but he is free. His state is even greatly preferable to that of the peasantry in a great part of Northern Europe. There are neither corvées nor villanage in New Spain, and the number of slaves is next to nothing. There the principal objects of agriculture are not the productions to which European luxury has assigned a variable and arbitrary value, but cereal gramina, nutritive roots and the agave, the vine of the Indians. The appearance of the country proclaims to the traveler that the soil nourishes him who cultivates it, and that the true prosperity of the Mexican people neither depends on the accidents of foreign commerce nor on the unruly politics of Europe."

It is not necessary here to enter into any review of the circumstances which brought about the absorption of these vast territories under successive Administrations. It is enough to say that the policy and the equity of the war with Mexico, which brought about the greater portion of the respective cessions, were seriously questioned by the better conscience of the nation, just as the war with Spain which brought us the *damnosa haereditas* (as some political leaders regard it) of the Philippines, was questioned by Sherman, Reed and other high-minded statesmen. But it is interesting to observe the similarity of the preliminary tactics in both cases. There was precisely the same process of stirring up animosity between the respective peoples by means of the press and the pen of the historian. The case of the conquest of California may be cited as a typical instance of a process graphically described in a homely formula about giving a dog a bad name. In the history of the United States by John Frost, LL. D. (1857) we find this reliable old process illustrated. California was discovered by Cortez in 1534, it is recorded, but not brought under the rule of Spain until 1769. Then Admiral Otondo, accompanied by a number of Jesuits under Father Eusebius Francisco Kino, set forth to open up a new and splendid territory to civilization. The historian finds little material for a narrative of how the undertaking fared, he says, but it was in the result successful, and he declares that its success was as much owing to the efforts of the ecclesiastics as those of the soldiers. This was the story of the Philippines over again. But the historian goes on to summarize the subsequent stage in a characteristic way. It is worth while quoting a passage or two:

"The Jesuits settled in the most fertile provinces and . . . entered ardently upon the trying task of proselyting the Indians. Per-

suasion and presents were the means commonly used; when these failed, force was resorted to."

No authority is cited by the historian for this statement. Why? Because, of course, he had none to offer. He was simply anticipating the advent of the "yellow journalist." To resume:

"After conversion each native was required to give ten years' faithful service to the mission, after which he was set at liberty," etc.

This is directly at variance with the prohibition of slavery by the Spanish crown as well as the whole procedure of the Jesuits and other religious orders with regard to the Indians. It is evidently a fabrication. Again: "During the revolts in 1836 the Indians were mostly cast off from their missions and deprived of the fruits of their labor. The country was visited, in 1841, by Captain Wilkes, at the head of the United States Exploring Expedition, who found it to be destitute of all government."

The Indians, he went on to say, were desperate because of the way they had been treated—of course by the Jesuits, it was understood, though not stated. For a country that was so destitute of government as described it put up a pretty stiff fight when our troops, under Fremont and Kearney and Stockton, invaded it to conquer it for a rule which is not particularly distinguished for consideration for Indians' rights, however much better it may be than that of either Spain or Mexico for the white settlers.

A volume might very easily be filled with the evidences of prejudice and passion which were always relied upon by cunning and ambitious statesmen and adventurers, at times of friction on the borders, to back up their schemes of aggrandizement when they came to the verge of war. Recent events in American development have not tended to allay the suspicions of the "Latin Republics" with regard to the dreams of their formidable Northern neighbor, and they exhibit their distrust by looking to other parts of the world for their needs in the way of commerce and manufactures. This is why Mr. Root has been despatched on an embassy of inquiry and conciliation. There will be a congress of nearly all the States next June, in Rio de Janeiro, and some good result may be hoped for from that important gathering. It is necessary for the world's peace that the distrust—the very natural distrust—of our intentions be removed from the minds of those people, so different from our own in many important respects. It is essential to our own commercial prosperity that they should have their suspicions disarmed. A great stumbling block in the way of peace will always be present so long as the enterprise of the professional missionary to the Catholic territories is sustained by commercial interest or mistaken religious zeal.

JOHN J. O'SHEA.

Philadelphia, Pa.

## SOME ASPECTS OF FREE WILL.

THE doctrine of a universal monism strongly appeals to the scientific mind. That the universe we see about us to-day, with its manifold beauties of sunlit earth and starlit sky, its wonders of life in all its forms, from the tiny plant even to the highest aspirations of the human intellect, was once latent in the simplicity of one primeval nebula, from whose womb it was gradually evolved without any new creation of matter or energy, is a thought that captivates the mind, yet tends to exalt rather than depreciate the wisdom and omnipotence of the Creator. Yet as the phenomena of nature are subjected, one by one, to examination, certain facts obtrude themselves upon our view, and the would-be Monist must not blind himself to their significance. Where do we find such facts? At the entrance to the vegetative world, at the threshold of animal life and sensation? At both these points the battle is still being waged; some philosophers still contend that life, even in its most humble form, betrays new energies that mere matter and motion can never explain, while their opponents as strongly profess to see nothing, even in the complexity of sensation, that may not have been fully latent in the "fiery cloud." But to pass these points by, we come to man, and at the threshold of human freedom the issue becomes more vital still and the contest more closely knit. If man's will is free, monism falls to the ground, for only the introduction of a new creative act can explain that freedom. The nebula which evolves under stress of necessary law cannot explain the new energy of man's will, which sets necessity itself at defiance. Hence the strenuous efforts of modern determinism to bring at all costs the human will within the domain of necessary law; hence the importance of outlining and defending the position that has ever appealed to reasonable men both inside and outside Christianity, that man's will is free and does not follow the impulse of motive as necessarily and surely as the rising and falling of the tides obey the influence of sun and moon.

Looked at from the moral standpoint, it would be difficult to overrate the importance of this doctrine of human freedom, lying as it does at the very root of all man's dealings with his fellow-men and God Himself. Tell man he is not free, and in the eyes of the average man punishment and reward, the sense of duty, the feeling of responsibility and remorse—all these, in their true significance, go by the board. Curious it is, then, to watch the positions taken up by determinists on this point. Many of them cannot but accept these consequences that the denial of free will entails; some of these,

startled at the gloomy outlook, would hide the truth—surely a becoming idea for those who boast themselves, par excellence, the friends of truth! Can you conceal the truth, or why should you ever do so? Is not *magna est veritas et praevalebit* the crystallized sense of mankind? Others, less scrupulous retailers of their chiefs, are not loath to accept the consequences. "No free will, no God" is their dogma; "let us eat and drink, for to-morrow we die." Quite a different position is adopted by others who boldly deny that any such evil effects must follow the loss of human liberty. "Remove this phantom of free will," they say, "and mankind will get along pretty much the same as before; man will still be amenable to motive; by punishing his misdeeds we shall make him regret that he ever committed them and take good care to avoid them in the future; by rewarding his good deeds we shall make him feel proud of duty well done, and inspire him with good intentions for the time to come." So speak some determinists, with what truth we shall see later on.

Our contention is briefly stated. We are convinced and feel that we deserve sometimes reward, sometimes blame, and this just because when we did act we really could have abstained from so doing. We are free, then, in many of our actions, and these the most vital and serious. Give a man clear deliberation when passion is not too strong, and he may act freely. It is only when the storm of passion, as it were, sweeps us off our feet or our intellects are blinded in its sudden outburst that true freedom is no longer ours. In the first moments of strong anger a man's hands close like a vice and his whole appearance betrays him as surely as the sky is overcast as the storm approaches. There is no freedom there. No, it is only when I deliberately consider the motive before me and give it a fair chance that I may bring into use my sacred prerogative of freedom and decide freely and as I choose.

The mention of motive brings us at once into our subject; to study how a motive works will facilitate our treatment. Man is by nature composite; he has both a body and a soul, each endowed with its own proper and distinct set of faculties for perceiving good and embracing it. Though profoundly distinct in character, these two sets of powers are so intimately connected that it is a received truth of psychology that there is no movement of sense-perception or appetite that has not a concomitant and corresponding motion in intellect or will; the one follows the other necessarily and inevitably. A motive, then, is presented to the intellect and appeals to the will through the senses, so that the first act of will necessarily embraces that good. So far the act of will is necessary. The intellect now adverts to what the will is doing. Can the will now cease to act?

If there are two motives there, can it choose between them, remembering that in this theory of motives they all drag the will necessarily at first?

It is clear, then, that we can have no act of will without a motive. So far we all go, but the Determinist goes farther still, and his contention may be briefly stated thus: The nature and strength of our motives are beyond our control; neither can we resist a sole motive or choose the weaker. As the needle seeks the magnet when one alone is present, and inclines inevitably to the stronger when more than one are in the vicinity, so we must will in accordance with a sole motive or with the stronger if more than one are present.

That we cannot control our motives in the sense that our hereditary dispositions and the circumstances of our training and existence largely account for their peculiar nature and strength, we do not doubt. My circumstances of the moment are often beyond me; my physical texture was woven for me long before I was born; my peculiar brain structure, on which the strength of my motives especially depend, was moulded for me by the long since recognized law of heredity. That law, in the passing of which their votes were not taken, truly accounts for a large number of the unhappy inmates of our lunatic asylums, jails and reformatories. In the peculiar bent of the child's character even in its early years you can trace the hand of its ancestors, just as the geologist may read in their furrowed markings on mountain and in valley the majestic march of the glaciers long ere the dawn of history.

That is true, and undoubtedly also those motives—not of our own choosing—very strongly influence our wills for good or evil. But are we completely at their mercy? Are we as much the sport of our circumstances and propensities as the rudderless ship on the open sea, toseed about by wind and wave? The Determinist would have it so. Given one motive only, the will cannot resist its influence; let more be present, victory must fall to the side of the stronger.

As to the first of these statements, that we necessarily follow the stronger motive, we are forced to deny it as a gratuitous assertion. The very opposite is borne out by the strong testimony of our own consciousness. Curiously enough, some determinists are wont to make the same appeal, showing thereby how important they deem it to have consciousness on their side if they can. Man's time-honored feeling that he is free has evidently proved a serious obstacle to their cherished dreams of a universal monism; they cannot overlook it and brush it aside, so they set about examining their consciousness anew—this time under the light of their own scientific theories—and, lo! they succeed in finding therein a new testimony

that man never found there before, for they now proclaim to the world, triumphantly and in all seriousness, that they feel they are not free!

They feel they are not free! Yes, it is all very well on paper, but like universal skepticism we may take it that, except in the case of a color-blind few, it can rarely boast of a more than paper-existence. And we need not enlarge upon a plain fact—that the average man thinks in his heart that he is free and regards his deliberate acts accordingly, feels an honest pride after duty performed in the face of strong opposing temptation and, inwardly at least, hangs his head with shame and suffers a keen remorse when the full malice of his deliberate evil action comes home to his mind.

Claiming, then, in all fairness the testimony of consciousness on our side, let us get somewhat closer to our subject by examining into the precise reason of this human liberty. How comes it, then, that we are free, and instead of being the plaything of inherited propensities we can, if we so will it, fight the good fight and live them down? A satisfactory answer can only be found in a peculiar power of the human intellect, which being denied the brute creation, they are thereby deprived of freedom also. Elsewhere we prove that man has a soul that is spiritual, a faculty of cognition also whose object is the universal, which can picture to itself good which is without limit and unalloyed. Possessing such a peculiar power, man may be free. If you put before him such a good, which is all good and in which he can see no limitation after advertence, he must embrace it. So it is, theologians teach, with the saints in heaven. In the pure goodness of the Infinite Divine Essence, which they appreciate as much as God allows and as far as finite intellect may, there is no limitation, no alloy, so that they must of necessity love and enjoy.

Different it is, however, with the goods of this world; none of them are without limit and deficiency, and when the intellect adverts to the fact that the will is tending to any one of them, being able to conceive for itself the abstract good, it at once sees the blemish, and this is the mental situation for which liberty is claimed.

What, then, of the first contention of the determinist that a single motive necessitates the will? Here many advocates of freedom seem to hold with our opponents, yet such a position seems a dangerous one to take up.

It is a physical law as necessary as the falling of a stone or the revolution of the spheres, that a single motive is irresistible before advertence, such is our physical constitution. Does the law hold after advertence before any second motive enters? If you say it does, where does the magic power of freedom come from when the

second motive appears on the scene? It must either arise from the spiritual power of the intellect or the brute has it also. Yet as the spiritual nature of the faculty gave no help in the first case, how does it aid in the second? Again, if there is no such possibility of mere non-action, mere refusal to accept a single particular motive, and if I can only avoid one act by taking refuge in the performance of some other quite different act, what becomes of that liberty of contradiction which has been a traditional prerogative of man in the eyes of Catholic philosophers?

Furthermore, if you allow a sole motive to conquer the will, even after advertence, it is difficult to argue against the conclusion of our opponents that when two or more are present it is the strongest which must gain the assent of the will.

"Thou canst, for thou oughtest." This trite saying of Kant is often used to crystallize one of the usual arguments for free will. To rightly estimate its value we must search carefully into the full significance of this "ought," as men have been wont to use it. If in reality men were not free agents at all, so that when they committed murder or avoided it they were in neither case full masters of their actions, it would still remain true, in a sense, that they *ought* to avoid such a crime; and as they would still remain amenable to motive, though not free under its influence, legislators and moralists would still punish and exhort, probably with even more energy than ever, to supply motives strong enough to prevent the slaying of innocent men. But is it in that limited sense that men generally understand the feeling of obligation, and is the good of society the true and only justification for punishment? Would a man feel remorseful and ashamed to have violated such an obligation, or deem himself entitled to a reward for its observance when he is convinced that in either case he could not have done otherwise? And does not true punishment presuppose responsibility? Men would surely cry shame on the government which would hang a lunatic for his mad act of murder or the sportsman who, having taken all due precautions, is yet unfortunate enough to shoot the man behind the fence while aiming at the bird flying over it. Yet if the public security were the only point to be considered, why should they not die? It would certainly render marksmen more careful of human life and property, and murder would be still more studiously avoided when even a plea of insanity found no hearing in a court of justice. No, we do not inflict punishment in such cases, because in the eyes of reasonable men the state of mind of the offenders plead strongly in their favor. They were not free at the time nor responsible, so they are not held accountable for their deeds. We inflict pain upon a horse to train him, or on a dog, for motive weighs with them also;

but we do not call that strict punishment, since we do not hold a horse responsible when he runs away or a dog when he bites our neighbor. It is needless to labor this point further. The ways of men are but modeled on those of God. As men of common sense, then, who are not wont to punish the madman and who inflict death only for deliberate and premeditated crime, we are not going to believe that an all-just and all-wise God has treasured up an eternity of wrath for him who walks in evil ways and an Eden of endless delights for him who loves the good and does it, whilst both alike are not more masters of their actions or act less necessarily than the bullet that speeds to the target under stress of necessary natural law. Obligation, therefore, as men have ever understood it, presupposes responsibility and human freedom. You command me to do the good and avoid the evil. Why not order the winds to blow and the tides to rise and fall, if all were equally latent in the nebula of old?

Yet it is not every "ought" that proves free will, but only that sense of absolute obligation coming from a being outside myself who commands me to observe the order he has constituted and will punish me for its violation only in so far as I am a responsible agent. We can conceive man before his reason has convinced him of the existence of a personal Creator; he feels at once, by an intuition of his reasoning faculty, that the world as he sees it and mankind as he understands them cannot subsist in anything like proper order if the slaying of innocent men were at all tolerated. He is as yet conscious of no obligation coming from without to avoid murder, yet he truly feels that he "ought" not to commit such a crime, seeing, as he does, that nature itself cries out against it as subversive of all order. Does this "ought" prove his freedom? He may feel that he is free to violate or observe; if so, you can appeal to that consciousness of personal liberty. But if the sense of freedom were not there, would the conviction of "ought" disappear also? Why should it? And if it should not, surely you cannot infer freedom therefrom.

However, as we have before remarked, it is not this slender sense of obligation that men possess as they contemplate the world around them. It is a far stricter sense of obligation, an absolute command coming from a Being outside this world, a Being who intends to safeguard the order He has constituted by first making man free and responsible for every deliberate action, and then rewarding or punishing him according to his works; a personal Lord and Creator whose existence men very soon come to realize when, clearing their minds of the obscuring mists of prejudice, they "look the facts of the universe straight in the face."

We have appealed to facts to support our contention, to the inner

testimony of our own consciousness, to the feeling of responsibility that every man vividly realizes when he is face to face with strong temptation, to the punishments even of this world, whose severity is clearly regulated according to the state of mind of the offender. Let us now turn to the determinists who assail even the possibility of human freedom and can see no room for such a reality in a universe of iron law.

You, they say, give a power to the will which the facts do not warrant, though you do not allow it to anticipate the impulses of the organism by preventing them; you make it direct them as it chooses; you allow it to reject the strong and follow as the lesser impulse may lead. Yet do not facts seem to teach the very reverse; that it is not the will that directs organic impulse, but organic impulse which rules the will? Look now at that man strongly rooted by long exercise in habits of honesty; a simple accident to his brain changes him into a helpless kleptomaniac—his will, hitherto seemingly strong, now at the mercy of organic impulse, his hand in everybody's pocket. See that other man buoyant with religious hope, for he knows that his God is a just God, who holds forth a strong arm to aid the soldier that fights His battles. A similar accident befalls him, and he is now a paralyzed creature, the springs of action all dried up, plunged into the depths of religious despair. So it has happened over and over again; disease or accident has turned honest men into thieves, strong-minded into helpless idiots, and has even robbed chaste souls of that queenly virtue, giving them even in advancing age the unholy desires of the profligate.

Now what do such facts prove, for that they are facts is quite beyond doubt? Surely they may be placed on the same footing as the recognized results of heredity with which, though they may differ in degree, they are one in kind. Some come into the world lunatics, most men with strong propensities of one kind or another, others become insane or have their habits changed by accident or disease. Is this strange? Is it not rather to be expected when we bear in mind that the soul and body are so intimately united that the first movements of intellect and will, when a good is presented to the mind, must exactly vary in nature and in intensity with the motions of the organism that precede them? Do we need psychology to teach us this? Rather do we not learn it from daily personal experience?

Since, then, the strength of organic impulse naturally depends on the physical state of the material organ, and since we may take it that the brain has its functions organized to a greater or less extent, is it not quite natural to expect that if an honest man has his brain damaged in the proper place he may now find it very difficult or well nigh impossible to will the deed of honesty that was an easy

work before? We say well nigh impossible, for as an injury to the brain may prevent a man thinking rationally at all, may it not be at times less sweeping but more selective in its effect, rendering him incapable of thinking and willing along certain special lines, whilst leaving him both energetic and free upon all others? The facts narrated of such peculiar accidents seem to point in that direction, hinting, too, that the secret of our facilities is to be sought for in peculiarity of organic structure, so that, as the structure is changed by disease or accident, propensities may change and facilities disappear, certain special impulses may become altogether impossible, and what is more important still, the will power in such directions seems to share the same fate.

As throwing light, then, on the intimate dependence of the soul of man and the organized frame which it vivifies, such facts are very interesting reading, but so far from militating against man's freedom, they leave the question quite untouched. Men come into the world and grow to manhood with marked propensities for which their ancestors and not they are responsible. Are their wills enslaved by such vicious inclinations? Can they put forth no effort to choose a better part? The common sense of mankind, the testimony of their inner consciousness, knows no determinism here, for it tells man that he is free and the maker of his own destiny. He may find the way rougher and more difficult to tread if he be handicapped with inherited propensities to evil, but they are by no means insuperable if he but struggle manfully on. Again, when accident has robbed your hitherto honest man of his sense of justice, are you quite sure there is no vestige of freedom remaining because you find his hand so often in the pocket of his neighbor? There is no room for freedom in the wild disorder of a lunatic's brain; so it may well be that in extreme cases the kleptomaniac has no longer power to keep his hands to himself, and our notion of the mind's intimate connection with matter can freely admit such a possibility; but surely until such an acute stage is reached we are not warranted in asserting that alongside the vicious habit which ensues on some unhappy accident there is no longer place for human liberty. If the propensities that were latent in him at birth and which forced themselves into view as years passed by left a man still free to battle against them, as his own consciousness clearly points out, why should a like propensity, the result of injury or disease, now make the hitherto honest man thieve like a machine that knows no freedom, or make the hitherto chaste now tread the opposite paths of vice whether he wills it or not? As my propensities, so will be my motives in nature and in strength, strongly influencing me for good or ill; but the determinist has not yet proved beyond mere assertion—

and that in face of unvarying inner testimony to the contrary—that the varying strength of my motives sway my will with the necessity of iron law.

The doctrine of the conservation of energy has supplied another weapon which determinists frequently make use of in their battle against human freedom. As far as the instruments of the skilled scientist can probe the secrets of nature, energy—material energy—is never added to, never subtracted from or destroyed. You may transform it in various ways; you can never increase or diminish its ever constant sum. The total amount of material energies in the complex universe of to-day is neither more nor less than that of the simple nebula of old. If this be a fact in the material world, will you extend it to the vital action of living things, to the free acts of man? And if you do so, as many have done and as our opponents are only too glad to do, how explain the free act of will which apparently—seeing that its peculiar duty is to direct the impulses of a material organism—must in its essential exercise add to or subtract from the energies of the material system which it modifies?

Determinism is very confident here. Does not this all-embracing formula lay once and for all this ghost of human freedom, which has so long haunted the pathway to their cherished monism? Let us face the difficulty.

To begin with, some apologists do not favor a rigid application of this principle all along the line. They would hold that the exercise of liberty, in its direction of organic impulse, does really change to a slight extent the amount of energy in the material system. They deny the facts and thus solve the difficulty. Yet, seeing that the curious and keen eyes of science have been long on the lookout for these minute changes in the amount of physical energy, but without success, most scientists and Catholic philosophers alike have come to apply the law all round and are seeking a reply to the difficulty from other sources.

It is, I think, the tradition of the schools that the true vital act is immanent; its term does not extend beyond the material organ within which it spontaneously arises; it modifies, as it were, the collocation of matter there, thus letting loose the material energies stored therein by the food we eat and the air we breathe, and which now do the work we will to do. We need not here discuss the obvious difficulty as to how the physical vital act could modify even the location of material particles without communicating some of its energy at least to the ether with which every organ is permeated through and through. We wish merely to notice the tradition on the point. Clearer still is the tradition when we come to the higher faculties. The analogous motions of intellect and will are certainly

immanent. Their own proper acts are termed within the spiritual powers themselves. Now that the will can modify organic impulse, directing it into channels in which it might not otherwise flow, is the very meaning of freedom. How precisely is this directive power exercised? Is the causality employed physical or moral? The Divine act is formally immanent, really identified with the Divine essence, yet its physical virtue goes out beyond, keeping the spheres revolving in their majestic orbits and conserving with a continual creation the lives and actions of the wondrous world of animated nature. Some would treat the human will likewise, giving it an action at once immanent and virtually transient, thus going outside itself to direct with a physical efficacy the impulses of a material organ. In this, a common view, what of the principle of the conservation of energy?

It seems rather incomprehensible, at first sight at least, that you can interfere at all physically with a system of material energy to produce there even a small modification without changing, slightly but really, the amount of energy contained therein. How is your physical work done if you expend no energy in doing it? The thing seems queer, yet some explanations are forthcoming.

Here is one, suggested briefly thus: "No power, no energy is required to deflect a bullet from its path, provided the deflecting force acts at right angles to that path." Put forward as a mathematical truth, we are not going to criticize it as such, but we doubt if its application here is above suspicion. Such a principle, if true, may apply here and there in nature, as in the circling of a planet about its parent sun or when the experimentalist tries to illustrate it in his laboratory; but the usual interaction of physical forces, from the close inspection of which this very law of conservation has been surmised, is not conducted at so precise an angle, nor may we judge it very probable that the deflecting force due to an action of the human will is ever to be found acting in a perpendicular direction to the path of the organic movement it is at the moment modifying.

Other apologists seek a solution by insisting on the doctrine of the Schoolmen that the soul and body constitute *one* complete substantial living being. Fr. Maher in his "Psychology" adopts this key to the difficulty, and as far as free will is concerned sums up his conclusions thus: "The material energy manifested in movement was previously stored in the living organic tissues; feelings and volitions merely determine the *form* it shall assume. Mental acts thus modify not the *quantity*, but the *quality* of the energy contained in the system." By the *quality* as distinct from the quantity, as he mentions just afterwards, the *direction* of the energy is to be understood.

Confining ourselves to the case of free volitions, let us see exactly what power we claim for the will in its dealing with organic impulse. It cannot anticipate or prevent them. Our own teaching, based naturally on personal experience, tells us that the will is no despot in this matter; a ripe and delicious fruit appeals to my sense appetite whether I will or no. Yet that we in some real way hold the reins in our own hands and can control our desires, is a truth also borne out by personal feeling and felicitously expressed by the Schoolmen when they say that the will, though not a tyrant, yet has a "politic" power over those wayward impulses. Does not this mean that though I cannot forestall its appearance or stifle it in its birth, yet I can really direct the impulse as I choose when already begun? And if so, does not the old difficulty crop up once more? No doubt a bullet must take a definite path in space if it is to move at all, yet it has an indefinite number of such paths lying open to it, the quantity of its energy—the mass and velocity—remaining unchanged; having once begun to move, however, with a certain velocity in a given direction, it is very difficult to conceive how that direction can be changed by any force which will not do real work and expend real energy in the process. Whatever about the ordinary vital acts, an appeal to the intimate union of soul and body does not seem to enlighten us as to the manner in which my free act of will can modify an organic impulse already begun and leave intact the principle of the conservation of material energy.

There is another alternative, however, which, if we may accept it, at once clears the difficulty from our path. Human acts of intellect and will are of such a nature that in their production the spiritual soul alone is concerned; the material organism is no "comprincipium" where they are in question; it merely supplies the matter whereon they work. They are, therefore, of their nature immanent. It is, moreover, difficult for reason to accept the notion of an act at once immanent and physically transient. It would be a perplexing consideration, even in the case of God, to hold that an act perfectly identified with the Divine essence can have for its term this world of beings outside that essence, just as it would be difficult to conceive how a Being, utterly unchangeable in Himself, can be ever conserving this ever-changing universe of His creation, were it not that this limited reason of ours finds a safe refuge, when face to face with such thoughts as these, in the limitless infinity of the Divine perfection. Are we going to give the creature also an act at once immanent and physically transient? Does not the difficulty increase so as to be almost insurmountable, since you have here no infinity of essence or act to fall back upon?

Perhaps, then, after all, my will does not physically interfere with

the organic impulse of my brain. It would not then be a physical cause of the modification that ensues. But are such causes the only true causes in the world? Are there not moral causes, too, and are they not real true causes? Are not the signed check and the deed, with the seal of the law upon it, real causes of the transfer of money and property? Does not the bribe really bring in the vote it so shamelessly purchased? Did not the word of command, though a blundering one, really send the Light Brigade madly but gloriously into the jaws of death? And must you hold that the sacraments of the New Law produce grace physically in the soul under pain of attributing to them no true efficacy at all? Surely the world is filled with such moral causes whose efficacy, though not physical, is yet true and real in a sense that men have never dreamt of attributing to mere occasions and conditions. Conceive, then, this transient efficacy of the spiritual act to be a moral one, so that given a motion of a certain strength and intensity in the will, God will infallibly modify the impulse of the organism accordingly. Is this a mere occasion? Has the mere occasion a "right" that the effect must follow? Yet it is in the action of such "rights" that a most important species of moral causality consists. Witness the check and deed, on the nature of whose efficacy we have a common theory of sacramental causality built up in modern times. May we not conceive that the intimate and close relation of the two sets of faculties we human beings are endowed with by our Creator includes a "right" of this nature, so that when I will to modify an impulse the intended effect follows as surely and infallibly as the bullet leaves my pistol's mouth when I press the trigger and my powder is dry? And if you still object that my own consciousness testifies that my act of will, not only morally but in some way physically, causes the external act or ensuing modification, I can fairly urge that, in the hypothesis I contemplate, the same inner testimony that I did it because I willed it would not be a whit less striking or less vivid than your contention supposes.

As I have hinted, this way of looking at the matter would seem to dispose of the *difficulty* proposed. If it is God Himself who modifies a system of energy, is it not quite possible to conceive that He who is the Prime Mover of all motion, holding all things in the hollow of His hand, conserving at each moment both the matter and energy of each minutest material atom, can give that energy in any direction He pleases without the slightest interference with that ever-constant sum which this formula of conservation seems to have vindicated for the energies of the material universe?

Thus briefly and in an imperfect manner we have touched some of the chief aspects of human liberty.

Monists may theorize, but we have no fear. There is no other truth that comes within its range on whose behalf personal consciousness pleads more unmistakably or with a clearer voice. Throughout the ages it has persevered. The men and women of to-day live and act up to the undoubting conviction that their destinies are in their own hands to make or mar. Look at the upright man who, scorning a life of ease and dissipation, acts a man's part and lives up to the high ideals of his nature. Give your honor to the army of holy souls, inspired by heavenly counsels, who desert home and kindred and the delights of a worldly life, choosing to walk unto the end in the blood-stained footsteps of their Saviour and Great Exemplar. Ask these honest souls are they free? You can easily anticipate their answer.

WILLIAM F. MURPHY.

Kilrain, Wexford, Ireland.

---

## CATHOLIC PROGRESS IN IRELAND.

WITHIN the last few years there has taken place in Ireland what may be described as a marvelous revival of zeal and energy in all the various departments of Catholic life and thought. The Catholic religion has, indeed, never ceased to flourish in Irish soil, like a strong and beautiful tree, ever growing apace, sending forth fresh shoots and never failing in blossom and fruit. But, on the other hand, it must be admitted that owing to want of combined organized effort there has been in the past what one might term a regrettable waste of Catholic zeal and energy. Through the long bead roll of the years all over the land, individual Catholics have lived lives of holiness, filled with self-denial and every Christian virtue. Burning zeal for God and His Church, fiery energy to do battle for the right; no one can say that there has ever been a time when these things were not to be found in Irish Catholic hearts. A strong, pure flame in some, in others it may be latent; but, active or latent, always there. And yet, on looking on the record of past years, we are struck with what seems a paradox; the co-existence with this intense fervor of Irish Catholicity of a strange torpor and apathy for want of united religious philanthropic endeavor.

But a great change, we are glad to notice, is passing over the land. Catholics are beginning to recognize that they have social and religious responsibilities which hitherto remained undischarged. We have begun to recognize, each and every one of us, that we have

responsibilities not alone with regard to our own souls and bodies, but also with regard to those of our neighbors. These responsibilities are neither to be shirked nor ignored. We cannot cry, "Am I my brother's keeper?" The Christian who will carry out the precepts of his religion cannot, like the priest and Levite in the Gospel, pass on the other side and leave his stricken brother to perish by the wayside. He must stoop to raise the fallen and pour into his wounds the oil of charity, let those wounds be of soul or body.

When the question of doing good merely involved the giving of money, then Irish Catholics have always been prodigal in their contributions. No appeal for charity, no matter what the object, ever failed to reach Irish hearts and purses. But that they should coöperate in charitable works by their own active exertions, this was a matter which did not command their sympathy or their understanding. Money they would give, freely, generously; but time, self-sacrifice, earnest, active efforts—well, these things did not commend themselves to most people. We are all very apt to say, when asked to work in any cause: "Oh, what good can I do? One person can do so little." We forget or do not realize the enormous force of united individual action. The magnitude of this want may be easily traced back to the misunderstanding previously existing between the masses and the classes—the masses robbed by the classes of their lands, their many educational facilities, social amenities, and left to live or die by those for whom at least gratitude for plunder should have suggested help to the despoiled. There were laws framed to set man against man in religious strife; to object was to raise every man's hand against his brother if he differed from him in religion, etc., etc., with the inevitable result of absence of all combination of heads to guide, hearts to sympathize and hands to work. Only too often any united effort at amelioration, social, educational or religious, was looked on with suspicion, and laws of suppression were enacted and police told off to execute them. Anything was good enough for the wretched Papist. But now a change!

In nothing is this change so strikingly exemplified as in the efforts being made to promote the cause of temperance. Since the days of Father Mathew this cause has never ceased to lie next the hearts of all true lovers of Ireland.

Drink has always been regarded as the deep-seated cancer which was gnawing into the very vitals of Ireland's life, destroying alike the souls and bodies of her children. Yet how ineffectual have been all the attempts hitherto made to cope with the disease. This failure did not result from any ignorance of the evil or from faint-heartedness in doing battle with it. The error lay in the remedies applied. The administration of the pledge to drunkards, inducing them to

become teetotalers; of course, such methods are good in their way. But when there is question of making a nation sober, stronger measures are required. The axe must be laid at the very root of the evil. We are told that "Prevention is better than cure," and all of us admit that "to lock the stable when the steed is stolen" is but poor wisdom. The truth contained in these homely axioms has been the fundamental idea of the founder of the "Pioneer Total Abstinence Society of the Sacred Heart," established in Ireland a few years since. The aim of this association is best described in the words of the explanatory leaflet:

"1. The Pioneer Association of Total Abstinence, founded in December, 1898, does not aim at the reclamation of the victims of excessive drinking, and hence receives only to membership those who have been temperate in the past and desire to practice total abstinence in voluntary self-sacrifice, and thus influence others to follow their example. They rely chiefly on prayer and the sacraments to help them in their heroic enterprise.

"2. The members are styled Pioneers, because they help to lead the way in the vanguard of temperance reform by word, example and prayer; because they resolve to brave and overcome every difficulty that hinders their undertaking, and, lastly, because they are determined with God's grace to persevere in their resolution unto death. Their life pledge is called the 'Heroic Offering,' and its outward, visible emblem (which must be always worn publicly) is a pendant, pin or brooch bearing on it the device of the Sacred Heart. At their reception into the association each receive a card of membership, together with the pioneer emblem.

"3. Should members be compelled by medical men to take any stimulants as a medicine, during the period of their taking them they shall not wear the pendant, pin or brooch, nor shall they resume it until they have resumed the practice of entire total abstinence from every kind of alcoholic stimulant."

Although so recently established, the association has already accomplished a gigantic work. It numbers more than 80,000 members, and every day its ranks are increasing. Nearly all the students of the various colleges, both lay and ecclesiastical, and all the children attending the convent schools throughout Ireland are Pioneers and wear the badge. In every town, village and hamlet, however remote, are to be found zealous promoters working might and main to further the sacred cause of total abstinence. The number to be met in Dublin and elsewhere wearing the pretty shield or brooch is remarkable and very consoling.

Such an association must inevitably become an enormous force in the cause of temperance. In the first place, the greater propor-

tion of its members are young people who have never known the taste of drink. Total abstinence is to them as a vesture, growing with their growth. Who can estimate the far-reaching influence of a generation trained from infancy in the ways of abstinence? In the next place this association affords to drunkards the striking example of members who not because they need reclamation or have ever yielded to temptation, voluntarily enroll themselves life members purely from a desire to help those who have fallen by their prayers and their example. Can we doubt the wonderful power of such an association?

Let us turn to another field in which Irish Catholics are also of late displaying much latent energy—the cause of pure, wholesome Catholic literature. What a field for Catholic workers lies here almost untilled. Drink and bad books. Who can doubt the souls lost to God by these terrible agents of evil? Shall we ever know until the judgment day the enduring, soul-destroying power of a bad book?

The power of a bad book is, so to speak, never-ending. From generation to generation its destructive forces continue, never diminished, never worn out. Year after year there pours into Ireland a vile, poisonous flood of English gutter literature, immoral, soul destroying. Yet this stuff is bought and read with avidity by thousands of our Catholic youth. It is useless to argue that they are the wrongdoers in buying it. The power to read begets a love of reading. The poor will read, and if they cannot have wholesome reading, then they will read what they can. This vile literature is exciting, sensational, cheap. And so it is bought and precious souls are ruined, innocence is destroyed and the devil gathers in a rich harvest.

In this, too, Irish Catholics have awakened to a more lively sense of their responsibilities. In November last very large and representative meetings of the Irish Catholic Truth Society were held in the Mansion House, Dublin. The sittings were presided over by Cardinal Logue, assisted by the Archbishop of Tuam. The question of the fearful evils of this abominable literature was fully discussed. Many eminent clergymen in burning words laid bare the plague spot and implored of Irish Catholics to spare neither money nor exertion to root it out from their midst. Schemes for the furtherance of this noble work were planned, and it was resolved that in the future more vigorous efforts would be made to spread amongst the people healthy, brightly written, entertaining books suitable to act as an antidote to the poisonous stuff which is killing faith and morals. The speakers advocated, and rightly, the publication by the society of works of fiction and romance. People require to be amused.

Good bread may be a very wholesome article of food, but a little jam is a very pleasant addition. To most of us, especially such of us as are toilers, the road of life is so dusty and monotonous that an occasional ramble in the flowery dells of fancy is a delightful diversion. At the same meeting a Reading Guild was formed to consist of ladies who would undertake to spread the publications of the Catholic Truth Society amongst their poor Catholic brethren.

We find Irish Catholics displaying similar activity in other departments, which though on a lower plane still affect their status in a considerable degree.

We allude to the movement becoming so universal for the restoration of the Irish language to its place as the living, every-day language of the people. This movement has evoked widespread enthusiasm.

The Irish language has been included to the curriculum of all, or nearly all, the colleges and schools, a class for Irish has been added to all the national schools and even night schools for the instruction of the poorest of the community include Irish in the subjects taught. Irish plays, Irish concerts, Irish dances are now the fashion of the hour. The national journals, daily and weekly, devote a certain amount of space to the publication of a story in Irish. Some patriotic traders have gone so far as to have their names and the nature of their business set forth in Irish characters over their shop doors. The question as to the feasibility of making the Irish language the ordinary work-a-day medium of communication is one on which there is much difference of opinion. Many wise and devoted friends of Ireland are at issue as to the utility of teaching it to those who must hereafter struggle for bread in the marketplace of the world. To enter into this controversy does not come within the scope of the present paper. But there is one point of view from which all must regard the movement as beneficial—the possession of a distinctive language fosters in a conquered nation a feeling of independence and self-respect which elevates the national character and creates a spirit of self-reliance. Self-respect in nations as in individuals is an excellent thing.

The same activity obtains with regard to Irish industries. Everywhere industries which had decayed are being revived and fresh ones are being daily established. Great efforts are being made by excellence of manufacture and reasonable price to compete with imported articles, so as to induce Irish people to patronize home manufactures.

The peasant girls in the Donegal Highlands are weaving carpets which in coloring and texture equal, if they do not surpass, the finest productions of Eastern looms. Irish lace the world over is a synonym for beauty. The same may be said of Irish linen.

Foxford tweed is patronized by royalty. The Foxford tweed industry was established some ten years since in the village from which it takes its name. In that time the nuns have transformed a plague spot of wretchedness and dirt into a clean, prosperous village, a hive of industry. They have banished hunger, sickness and dirt from the humble homes, and cleanliness, thrift and modest comfort now reign in their stead. Basket work of every description is made in remote Letterfrack by the children of the neighborhood.

The latest development of Irish industry is the manufacture of excellent brown wrapping paper from peat. In all the various arts and handicrafts—stained glass, silver and metal work, book binding, printing, etc.—we find the same revivification and awakening of latent activity.

The present outlook in matters spiritual and temporal augurs well for the future of Ireland. A great many Catholics fail to recognize that their social status has a reflex action upon their religion. They cannot understand how things temporal can affect the spiritual. Yet it is so. The more Catholics, by their industry, perseverance and rectitude raise themselves socially, so do they in a corresponding measure elevate their religion in the eyes of their fellow-men.

E. Leahy.

Dublin, Ireland.

---

## JOAN OF ARC.

IN THE picturesque little village of Domrémy, on the left bank of the River Meuse, was born Joan of Arc, the unique peasant girl of grand historic fame. Authors slightly differ as to the year of her birth, but whether born in 1410 or a year or two later makes little account in view of the magnificent achievement of her brief life, with its guerdon of a martyr's crown and the deep applause of posterity. And whether she was French born or a Lorrainer, concerning which some doubt has also been expressed, is likewise of slight import, comparatively.

Her parents, Jacques d'Arc and Elizabeth Romeé, or d'Arc, possessed little of the world's goods, but enough for their humble and unambitious needs. They had two sons and three daughters, Joan or Jeanne being the youngest. Whatever her early training may have been, it is certain she was very different from the spoilt idol of an over indulgent parent or the precocious child of modern notoriety. She was mentally and physically superiorly endowed. Simple and unlettered as she was, having never learned to read or

write, she possessed what was infinitely better than learning—the jewel of an innocent soul unspotted in its unsophisticated freshness. She knew the Pater, the Ave and the Credo, taught her at her mother's knee. It is said of her that she was a daily attendant at early Mass, and that besides making frequent visits to the near-by church she was often found on her knees before the altar of the more distant Church of Our Lady of Bermont, situated on a hill overlooking the Meuse. The poor and the sick found in her a most devoted friend.

It is delightfully interesting to linger near the pleasant scenes of Jeanne's home, to picture in imagination the peaceful meadows and quiet hills in which Domrémy nestled and learn the story of her childhood days, her early piety and modest sharing in the light-heartedness of the village children who were accustomed to playing under "The Laydy's Tree," which stood in isolated prominence on a hilltop by the riverside, separated from the groves near by that formed a picturesque background to the vales below. A legendary belief existed to the effect that the fairies sometimes gathered beneath this tall and shapely tree on moonlit nights and danced and frolicked in great revelry there. As if in imitation of the fairies, the village children celebrated a yearly festival beneath its pendant branches, wreathing its boughs with garlands of flowers and singing and dancing in the exuberance of childish freedom. Joan, who always accompanied the other children to this *fête,* occupied her time there in singing joyously whilst weaving garlands or in silent communing with thoughts solicited by her religious feelings.

She was only three years of age when the battle of Agincourt was fought, resulting in such a victory for the English King, Henry V., as soon left him master of all that portion of France north of the Loire. About five years later Henry VI. of England, while yet in his infancy, was acknowledged as next heir to the throne of France, to the exclusion of the Dauphin, by the Treaty of Troyes, concluded between the English King and Charles VI. and Isabella, his wife, whose daughter was also to be given in marriage to the royal conqueror, Henry's son. This treaty was consummated through the imbecility of the French King and the influence of his wife, who was the real power behind the throne. Her daughter Catherine was the wife of the English King. And thus one woman brought a bitter humiliation upon France, for which another was sacrificed for the nation's ransom.

It is no wonder that the Treaty of Troyes did not result in the peace which it was intended to secure. For years the war's ruthless spoil and devastation continued, resulting in great loss and suffering to the peasantry, whose goods and chattels were pillaged

and whose once peaceful homes went up in smoke and flame with but a moment's warning.

Domrémy did not escape from this general curse of a lingering warfare. Its people were among those who remained faithful to the rights of the Dauphin to the throne of France. The apparently resistless invaders, aided by the alliance of the Burgundians, eagerly followed up their successes until at last France seemed doomed to utter defeat, notwithstanding the determined resistance of those who fought for the Dauphin and fatherland. The Dauphin, afterwards Charles VII., a wise and peaceful King, was compelled at last to retreat to the Castle of Chinon.

In this grave crisis well might France pray for deliverance, for some strong arm that would, like that of the Bruce in his might at Bannockburn, chastise the pride of England. Strange as it would seem to any one, at the time when the English felt so assured of complete and lasting success and France was fast sinking into hopeless despair, that the humble virgin of Domrémy, ambitionless, illiterate, entirely untrained in the arts of peace or war, and living in peasant obscurity in the daily performance of her lowly duties, spinning or threading the needle or tending her father's sheep on the hillside, would be made the instrument of Divine Providence, in answer to such a prayer, no such wonder should arise on account of so regarding her after the performance of her marvelous deeds on the battlefield, when her mission ended in the rescue of France from the closing grasp of English domination. But it was reserved for a later time to reveal the truth about this singular child of destiny, whose fate reflects everlasting dishonor upon those who were responsible for it. At first when she could offer no proof of her mission except her own declaration as to its Divine origin, as evidenced by the "Voices," by whom she said she was guided, it was not surprising that men were slow to believe her or that they placed no confidence in what they regarded as foolish pretensions.

Time, the great avenger, has unmasked the rank injustice and ingratitude of her condemnation. Many eminent authors have written her life's story, so full of pathos and the sublimity of unselfish heroism and devotion. They have all, with one or two exceptions, concurred in vindicating her name as irreproachable.

When Joan was about twelve years of age she began to hear strange voices. Her pity had been keenly aroused at this tender age in behalf of suffering France, upon whose wrongs she often meditated with the deepest sympathy for the oppressed. It was in the summer of 1424 that she first heard a voice calling her while in her father's garden, as if it came from the village church. This mysterious voice which called her to the rescue of France was fol-

lowed by a revelation she believed from heaven. St. Michael, St. Catherine and St. Margaret, whose strange voices she thought she heard encouraging her, became names dear and familiar to her afterwards. The archangel spoke to her of the misfortunes of France. For about four years after this, before she decided upon any course of action, she heard mysterious voices which in time led her to believe that she was commissioned by God to deliver France from the English and their allies.

In January, 1429, she journeyed to the nearest military station, Voucouleurs, and stated to its governor, Robert de Baudricourt, her mission to save France. Baudricourt, not unreasonably, discredited her story or its meaning as interpreted by her.

The governor and his officers regarded her with mild surprise and ridicule when she persistently asked in her own simple and earnest way to be brought to the Dauphin. Baudricourt asked the parish priest to exorcise her, but this recourse did not dampen her ardor in the least. She was strangely determined to overcome all opposition.

As if to rid himself of her importunities, Baudricourt, when she had returned to him from Nancy, whither she had gone to ask in vain the aged Charles II., Duke of Lorraine, to help her to reach the Dauphin, consented at last to her going to the Castle of Chinon, where the latter had retreated, and charged his men, an armed escort numbering only six, to protect her well. It was her cherished conviction that the Dauphin should be crowned and anointed in the Cathedral at Rheims before assuming the title of King, and her exactly realized prophecy of that event explains her eagerness for it consummation, regardless of all dangers and discouragements.

After a journey of about three weeks she reached Chinon and saw the Dauphin for the first time on the 9th of March, 1429. His mind was then so occupied with the desperate affairs of France that he had little time or inclination for the reception of the strange visitor from distant Domrémy. But her words, uttered with the ardor of her great sincerity and singular enthusiasm, filled him with wonder, although he still remained unconvinced. Then followed, at his request, her interrogation by ecclesiastics, theologians, lawyers and university clerks. But she passed through this critical ordeal unscathed. They found in her nothing but "goodness, humility, devotion, honesty, simplicity." Their questions failed to disturb in the least her calm sincerity and unruffled demeanor, while the simplicity yet strange pertinency of her answers amazed their astuteness and learning.

The following month found her at Chinon with an enthusiastic following of 6,000, including some of the most distinguished knights

and soldiers of the French army. Clad in white armor and wearing man's dress, she rode a black charger bearing her standard, embroidered with white lilies, the *fleur-de-lis,* blessed, as she believed, by God. Her presence inspired the people with unbounded courage and enthusiasm. A demand in a letter sent to Bedford, the English regent, that he should give up the keys of all the cities taken by the English was first made by her, but the English, as might well have been expected, only treated her request with laughter and derision.

Not since the days of Peter the Hermit and Richard *Cœur de Lion* were men so stirred with the eager spirit of a holy crusade as were the army of Joan of Arc when, on April 28, 1429, she left Blois at their head for the relief of Orleans, sorely pressed by the besiegers. Within twenty-four hours afterwards victory descended upon the *fleur-de-lis,* the maid entered Orleans in triumph and from henceforth hers became a name to conjure with throughout *la belle France.* The people of Orleans acclaimed her as their heaven-sent deliverer. The brave Dunois, who had fought so hard in defense of the beleaguered city, hoping against hope for many weary days, was inspired with new courage and confidence under her most skillful and effective leadership. Her tireless energy and supreme self-confidence reflected themselves from the changed spirit of the people of Orleans. The English, harassed by the repeated sorties made by the defenders, became proportionately dispirited, and the bright sun of the 8th of May saw their hasty retreat.

The news of the relief of Orleans, followed by a series of victories, culminating in the battle of Patay, awakened a new spirit throughout France. The maid's divine mission was popularly acclaimed; men flocked from all parts of France to her consecrated standard, and far sundered provinces, the vales of Lorraine and hills of Toulouse, reëchoed her praises in songs attuned to a new-born patriotism.

Most wonderfully did Joan of Arc succeed in moulding the army to the pattern which her pure mind had sanctioned. Her discipline, which was perfect, was obeyed without a murmur, yea, even cheerfully. The pillage and coarseness, the blasphemy, intemperance and desecration which so often stain the records of other armies, were entirely absent from hers. The firm and unalterable disallowance by her of such immorality, the great improvement of the standard of morals in the army through the infectious influence of her pure life, bespeak her praise and vindicate her name more effectively than the victories of Orleans and Patay. It was but fitting that she who believed her mission was divine, that the army who fought under her sacred banner should earn this enviable notoriety.

The celerity of her movements, in disdain of many perils, had now ceased to cause surprise, because of their frequent repetition.

After the battle of Patay she hastened to Rheims for the coronation of the Dauphin as Charles VII. King of France, which took place on July 17, 1429, within about six months from the active commencement of her campaign.

And now it seemed her work was finished. France was saved. Her star was in the ascendant.

But already she lived in the shadow of war's reverse of fortune. It was suddenly revealed to her by a voice that she would be taken prisoner before St. John Baptist's day. Charles VII. failed to profit by the exalted spirit of ardent patriotism which had seized upon the nation through the splendid example of the Maid of Orleans. With wavering indecision he halted, and in such circumstances as he was placed to hesitate was to be lost. Paris remained in the hands of the enemy.

The fate of Compeigne was next threatened, and Jeanne hastened to its assistance with her accustomed promptness. In a mere skirmish with the enemy which followed she was taken prisoner by the Burgundians on May 23, 1430. And now her night of evil, her Gethsemane, had begun. But her great work was accomplished. France was delivered from English sway forever.

Jeanne's capture at Compiegne, her delivery by Jean de Luxembourg to the Duke of Bedford, the English King's lieutenant in France, for about the price of £16,000 in the following November, her imprisonment in the Castle of Rouen in December, her surrender to the Bishop of Beauvais in January as "suspect of heresy" by order of Henry VI. of England. Her trial, condemnation and death were fast crowding tragedies in the tableau of her misfortunes. Her story, mingling the simple with the sublime, is ever of thrilling inspiration. Some of the wonderful incidents recorded of her recall the era of the prophets of Israel and of the martyrs of the Coliseum. When her body was burned to ashes her heart remained whole and bleeding, according to the story of her executioner. Many stated that they saw the name of Jesus written in the flames by which she was consumed, and a third, who was foremost in his hatred of her, was converted by seeing, as he stated, her soul leave her body in the form of a white dove.

Brother Seguin in a sworn testimony said among other things: "And then she foretold to us—to me and to all the others who were with me—these four things which should happen and which did afterwards come to pass: First, that the English would be destroyed, the siege of Orleans raised and the town delivered from the English; secondly, that the King would be crowned at Rheims; thirdly, that Paris would be restored to his dominion, and fourthly, that the Duke d'Orleans should be brought back from England.

And I who speak, I have in truth seen these four things accomplished."

Bedford, the hope of the English army in France, died in 1435. The next year Paris was restored to the French, as foretold by Jeanne to the judges, and within about twenty years after her death Normandy was totally lost by the fall of Cherbourg in 1450. In 1453 the English lost their last foothold except Calais.

How like a Biblical story the following account, testified to by Brother Pasquerel: "On the third day we arrived at Orleans, where the English held their siege right up to the bank of the Loire. We approached so close to them that French and English could almost touch one another. The French had with them a convoy of supplies, but the water was so shallow that the boats could not move up stream, nor could they land where the English were. Suddenly the waters rose and the boats were then able to land on the shore where the French army was. Jeanne entered the boats with some of her followers and thus came to Orleans."

No wonder that the English in their war with France were eager to destroy such a valiant woman as this who had heaped disasters upon their heads and predicted more to come. And so at last they contrived to bring her to the stake to be burned as a witch and heretic, a fate often in later times reserved for the victims of religious hate and fanaticism, but not so in this case, for England and France held to the one religion when the tragedy occurred. And Jeanne d'Arc's execution as a condemned heretic was unique, among other things, in that on the morning of her execution she received absolution and Holy Communion at the hands of the Church and seemingly with the knowledge of the judge who read her sentence of excommunication.

The official report of the trial and condemnation as well as subsequent rehabilitation of Joan of Arc, written in the Latin text, was first published by Quicherat, who had discovered it about the middle of the last century buried in the archives of France. This rescued document was rendered into English for the first time by T. Douglas Murray in his "Jeanne d'Arc, Maid of Orleans," published in 1902.

The many sittings held by the judges who tried and sentenced Jeanne d'Arc first to imprisonment and subsequently handed her over to the secular power to be burned at the stake, gave a misleading appearance of impartiality to the proceedings. As a matter of fact, the proof adduced at these sittings of any of the allegations of grave import contained in the "Act of Accusation" is strikingly insufficient. And notwithstanding this lack of proof, the Bishop of Beauvais, who instituted the proceedings at the request of the King of England, asserted at the commencement that the maid's offenses

against religion and morality were even the subject of common public rumor. Briefly these were divination and sorcery, claiming to have had revelations through saints who spoke to her and whom she saw, consequent blasphemy, wearing a man's dress and disobedience to the Church, shedding human blood in war.

This assertion could only be justified on the assumption that the Maid of Orleans was a notoriously bad woman, wanting in all the virtues afterwards attributed to her on oath during the process of her rehabilitation by a great many who were very intimate with her.

A disregard of the other side of the question is manifest throughout all the examinations of the accused preceding the sentence of her condemnation. Was it that her judges were blinded by zeal for the extermination of heresy? Unhappily for their memory, there are many indications to point to the fact that this was not the cause of their seeming so persistently blind to the virtues of the Maid of Orleans. At the outset the Bishop of Beauvais found no use for the evidence of her character obtained, at his own request, at her birthplace, Domrémy, although it is evident that he would have gladly used it if it had in any way reflected unfavorably upon her instead of representing her as a paragon of virtue.

The inquiry as to the maid's life at Domrémy was ordered by the Bishop in January, 1431, the trial or process *ex-officio,* which included six public and nine private examinations of the accused, began on the 21st of February following and ended on the 26th of March, when the "Act of Accusation," multiplying each offense by its repetition, use of prolix terms like legal phraseology and otherwise, consisting of "Seventy Articles," was drawn up. On the next day, the 27th of March, the "Process in Ordinary" began with the reading of the "Seventy Articles," upon each of which the accused was examined. On the 24th of May, 1431, she was condemned to perpetual imprisonment, her so-called act of abjuration having in the meantime saved her from excommunication and death. It may reasonably be surmised that the difficulty of obtaining proof against the accused, which would make the punishment inflicted appear as fair and just as possible, had thus lengthened the proceedings.

When, within a few days following the sentence of imprisonment, it came to the knowledge of the judges that Jeanne had resumed in prison her male attire and again expressed her belief in her visions, they allowed very little time indeed for deliberation before handing her over to the tender mercies of the English, whose vengeance impatiently awaited her. During that short interval she was exhorted and admonished by the Bishop and his assistants, but always on the assumption that she was an incorrigible sinner. Even on the morning before pronouncing the fatal words of the final sen-

tence, the Bishop of Beauvais renewed these counsels for the benefit of the Maid, who could not bring herself to believe that those who judged her so severely spoke the voice of God through the Church Militant as explained to her. On the 30th of May was read and carried into execution the final sentence, which, after reciting the many opportunities given the accused to repent, repeated a string of general and indefinite accusations to which she had become so accustomed to listen. These charges were always devoid of any mitigating qualification, such as Jeanne furnished by her answers in defense, which was utterly ignored. The sentence after declaring the Maid "excommunicate and heretic," and that she is abandoned to the "secular authority," ends thus: "Praying this same power that as concerns death and the mutilation of the limbs, it may be pleased to moderate judgment; and if true signs of penance should appear in thee that the Sacrament of Penance may be administered to thee." Jean Lemaitre, the associate judge, acted as such, it seems, contrary to his inclinations, and it is fair to assume that his judgment, therefore, was not entirely free.

The beautiful story of her real character is learned from the official inquiries made during the progress of the rehabilitation. The Bishop of Beauvais deemed it outside his duty as judge to order that a report of what took place at the burning of Jeanne should be included in the "process" or record of the trial. The story of the execution has, however, been sufficiently preserved by the sworn testimony of many witnesses who saw what happened and heard what was said at the burning of the Maid of Orleans.

As regards the trial itself, the opinion of many leading jurists is in effect that it was worthless for several reasons, and if so, the judgment which followed it was therefore valueless, irrespective of the evidence. Chief among these lawyers was Lohier, of whom Maitre Gillaume Manchon, the principal one of the three notaries who wrote down the questions put and answers given at the trial, said in his sworn testimony during the progress of the rehabilitation: "Maitre Jean Lohier, a grave Norman Clerk, came to this town of Rouen and communcation was made to him of what the Bishop of Beauvais has written hereon; and the said Lohier asked for two or three days' delay to look into it. To which he received answer that he should give his opinion that afternoon; and this he was obliged to do, and Maitre Jean Lohier, when he had seen the process, said it was of no value for several reasons; first, because it had not the form of an ordinary process; then, it was carried on in an enclosed and shut-up place where those concerned were not in full and perfect honour of the King of France, whose side she (the Maid) supported, liberty to say their full will; then, that this matter dealt with the

and that he had not been called, nor any who were for him; then, neither legal document nor articles had been forthcoming, and so there was no guide for this simple girl to answer the Masters and Doctors on great matters, and especially those, as she said, which related to her revelations. For these things the process was, in his opinion, of no value. At which my Lord of Beauvais was very indignant against the said Lohier; and although my Lord of Beauvais told him that he might remain to see the carrying out of the trial, Lohier replied that he would not do so."

Manchon further on adds that he saw Lohier the next day after this opinion was made known to the Bishop, and he said to him in reference to the trial: "You see the way they are proceeding. They will take her, if they can, in her words—as in assertions where she says, *'I know for certain'* as regards the apparitions, but if she said *'I think'* instead of the words *'I know for certain,'* it is my opinion that no man could condemn her. It seems they act rather from hate than otherwise; and for that reason I will not stay here, for I have no desire to be in it." And in truth he thenceforward lived always at the Court of Rome, where he died Dean of Appeals.

Maitre Thomas de Courcelles, a canon of Paris, in his deposition said, among other things, that Lohier on seeing the evidence against Jeanne told him "that evidently they ought not to proceed against her in a matter of faith without previous information as to the charges of guilt and that the law required such information. Lohier's opinion that the trial was worthless is more clearly summarized as follows by Mr. Murray in an appendix: "(1) On account of its form. (2) That the assessors were not at liberty to hold their own views, the trial being in the Castle and therefore not in open court. (3) That no opportunity was given to the party of the French King to speak for themselves. (4) That Jeanne herself was allowed no counsel nor had proper documents been prepared to support the accusation."

According to the deposition of Jean Massien, Dean, on his second examination in connection with the rehabilitation, Jeanne had asked for counsel, but was refused. Brother Martin Ladvenu, a Dominican, on his second examination deposed as follows: "I knew well that Jeanne had no director, counsel nor defender up to the end of the process, and that no one would have dared to offer himself as her counsel, director or defender, for fear of the English. I have heard that those who went to the Castle to counsel and direct Jeanne by order of the judges were harshly repulsed and threatened." Manchon in his deposition said: "During the process and almost up to the close Jeanne had no counsel; I do not remember if she asked for one, but towards the end she had Maitre Pierre Maurice

and a Carmelite to direct and instruct her." As these were spiritual advisers appointed towards the close of the case, there is practically no conflict between this and the testimony of the other two witnesses.

It is stated by the Bishop of Beauvais himself near the beginning of the process that he offered her counsel from among one of his assessors, but that she refused. In view of the fact that these assessors, who were for the most part canonical lawyers and practically assistant judges, though not so named, were liable to be unduly influenced, her refusal was but another instance of the marvelous foresight and prudence displayed by one of her age and illiteracy during the whole of the trial. The body of these assessors were inclined to act justly, and several were very friendly to Jeanne on account of the unfairness of the examination, but they could exercise their friendship towards her only at their peril, as was proved by the sworn evidence of several witnesses in connection with the process for Jeanne's rehabilitation.

At the conclusion of the investigation made in 1450 at the instance of King Charles VII., who empowered Guillaume Bouille, rector of the University of Paris, to inquire concerning the circumstances of Jeanne's trial, etc., great lawyers gave their opinions and declared the trial void, being "bad in substance as well as in form," though this inquiry was not followed by any formal judgment as to Jeanne's condemnation.

It is commonly held also, as stated by Mr. Murray in his introduction, that the Bishop had no jurisdiction, Jeanne having been captured in one province and tried in another. Moreover, she had been tried previously at Poitiers, at the request of the Dauphin, Charles VII., who would not accept her aid before being assured that she was not unworthy. Inasmuch as the Archbishop of Rheims, the metropolitan of the Bishop of Beauvais, and his clergy at Poitiers found no fault in her, it was of very doubtful right that she should be placed on trial a second time before an inferior court. Mr. Murray seems to regard the first examination as conclusive against the legality of the second. But such a conclusion cannot be reached without assuming that Jeanne had not rendered herself liable for heresy or other offense against the laws of the Church since the examination at Poitiers, or in any event that an inferior court had no jurisdiction. However, the question of jurisdiction does not now concern much the merits of the case in view of the many stronger grounds for condemning the trial in its form and substance—grounds which made a later ecclesiastical court of inquiry denounce the proceedings in most unmeasured terms as "a pretended process."

The court that tried Jeanne at Rouen did not follow in form and composition the practice of the English courts of ecclesiastical inquiry

established by 2 Henry IV., chapter 15, which prescribed death as the penalty for heresy, although Rouen was at the time subject to English sovereignty. It was not a statutory court of inquiry at all, but it assumed the exercise of a power similar to that possessed by the aforesaid English courts, which empowered the diocesan to try persons accused of heresy and on conviction hand them over to the Sheriff without waiting for the King's writ.

The secular authority was indeed personally present, but conspicuously absent as far as the exercise of his functions was concerned, at the place of execution. The sentence of excommunication, which was read at the Old Market Place at Rouen on the morning of the day of Jeanne's execution, abandoned her to the civil authority, represented by the Bailly of Rouen and his deputy, who were present. But immediately after the reading of the sentence Jeanne was forced by two sergeants from the platform and delivered over to the executioner with the remark: "Do thy duty." Brother M. Ladvenu on examination said: "Directly Jeanne was abandoned by the Church, she was seized by the English soldiers, who were present in large numbers, without any sentence from the secular authority, although the Bailly of Rouen and the counsels of the secular court were present."

It was not the fault of the Bailly that this grave irregularity occurred, but the fact that he was allowed no time for the performance of his duty shows that brute force prevailed over law and order; that the military power represented there by about eight hundred English soldiers recognized no right but might in their eager haste to remove the cause of Bedford's frequent defeat and humiliation. That power made itself felt during the whole course of the trial of Jeanne, whose misfortune was to be judged by a court subject to its malign influence.

Her imprisonment at the outset in a lay prison in the Castle of Rouen while tried before an ecclesiastical court for an offense or offenses against the Church, from whose prisons she was excluded against her wishes, can be explained only as a shameful compromise with the secular power. How many innocent persons have been condemned to avert the wrath of Cæsar since the day the meek and lowly Nazarene was sacrificed for fear of the Roman power!

Brother M. Ladvenu, a Dominican of the Convent of St. Jacques at Rouen, on one of his examinations states that the Bishop of Beauvais, acting as judge, commanded Jeanne to be kept in the secular prison and in the hands of her enemies, and although he might easily have had her detained and guarded in an ecclesiastical prison, yet he allowed her from the beginning of the trial to the end to be tormented and cruelly treated in a secular prison. More-

over, at the first session or meeting the Bishop aforesaid asked and required the opinion of all present as to whether it was more suitable to detain her in the secular ward or in the prisons of the Church. It was decided as more correct that she be kept in ecclesiastical prisons rather than in the secular, but this the Bishop said he would not do for fear of displeasing the English.

The "Seventy Articles" composing "The Act of Accusation" were reduced to twelve articles, each of which singled out some alleged faults on Jeanne's part apparently magnified into a grave offense against the Church, the offenses named in one article being sometimes repeated in another, the whole being a tissue of statements torn from the contexts of the process of examinations of the accused, without any mention of her explanations or answers in defense, except where some of these might be made to appear in their unexplained separation as unfavorable to her. Before the judges found heart to condemn the accused they sent these twelve articles to the University of Paris in order to obtain the opinion of its professors upon them. This other body, judged from this distorted presentation of the case and without taking any evidence in the presence of the accused or her counsel, reported their decision against her.

This proceeding was severely condemned by the court which pronounced the sentence of the Maid's rehabilitation. Paris was in the occupation of the English at the time its university gave this extraordinary decision, and therefore the probability is that subserviency to military power had its baneful influence in this instance also.

On the first occasion when Jeanne's sentence of condemnation was being pronounced it was interrupted by her so-called act of abjuration, which on its face was a confession of guilt and resulted in her being sentenced to perpetual imprisonment. Subsequently, after she was deemed as having relapsed in prison, the sentence was pronounced against her in full, as above stated. In regard to her abjuration, several witnesses deposed at examinations held in connection with the process of her rehabilitation. Massieu said: "At the end of his sermon Maitre Gillaume Erard read a schedule containing the articles which he was inciting Jeanne to abjure and revoke. To which Jeanne replied that she did not understand what abjuring was, and that she asked advice about it. Then Erard told me to give her counsel about it. After excusing myself for doing this, I told her it meant that if she opposed any of the said articles she would be burned. I advised her to refer to the Church Universal as to whether she should abjure the said articles or not. And this she did, saying in a loud voice to Erard, 'I refer me to the Church Universal as to whether I shall abjure or not.' To this Erard replied: 'You shall abjure at once or you shall be burned.' And indeed before

she left the square she abjured and made a cross with a pen which I handed her." In a later examination Massieu repeats in effect this testimony and states that he "saw clearly that Jeanne did not understand the schedule nor the danger in which she stood, although he was constrained to warn her of the peril which threatened her if she signed it." It seems plain, therefore, that while in a state of doubt or hesitation arising from her being mystified as to the meaning of abjuring or the real effect of signing the paper, her will and judgment were influenced by Erard's threat.

Manchon in one of his examinations said, among other things: "What she had said in the abjuration she said she had not understood, and that what she had done was from fear of the 'fire.'" Two other witnesses refer to the abjuration. Maitre Gillaume de Lachambre, master in arts and medicine, said: "Erard decided her by saying that if she did what he advised her she would be delivered from prison. She abjured on this condition, and on no other." The inference is that this influenced her mind also in addition to the threat. Brother Pasquerel said that Jeanne on being handed a little written schedule and a pen, "by way of derision," made "some sort of round mark," and that then Laurence Calot, a secretary of the English King, who handed her the pen, "took her hand with the pen and caused her to make some sort of signature."

But of greater import is the fact that the long schedule embodied by the judges in the process as Jeanne's abjuration was never signed by her, according to the sworn testimony of several most reputable witnesses. The schedule contained in the process contains fifty-four lines. The one signed by Jeanne about eight!

Massieu, whose testimony on the subject of the abjuration has already been partly quoted, said: "Erard, holding the schedule of abjuration, said to Jeanne: 'Thou shalt abjure and sign this schedule,' and passed it to me to read, and I read it in her presence. I remember well that in this schedule it was said that in future she should not bear arms or wear male attire or short hair, and many other things which I do not remember. I know that this schedule contained about eight lines, and no more, and I know of a certainty that it was not that which is mentioned in the process, for this is quite different from what I read and what was signed by Jeanne."

De Lachambre deposed that he remembered "well the abjuration made by Jeanne," a small schedule containing six or seven lines on a piece of paper folded in two. Maitre Jean Monnet, S. T. P., canon of Paris, said: "I saw the schedule of abjuration which was then read; it was a short schedule, hardly six or seven lines in length." This well attested fact, never disproved, of itself greatly lessens the value of the whole process by placing its authenticity on

trial. And even admitting its genuineness, except in this instance, it nowhere discloses the fact that Jeanne expressed her disbelief in the Church or refused to submit to its authority as she understood it. The judges based their conclusions on inconsequent inferences from Jeanne's refusals to pliantly answer the subtle and confusing questions put to her throughout a trial that seemed like a persistent endeavor to entrap her in her undefended innocence. Apart from the spurious abjuration, there is no conclusive evidence submitted in the very lengthy and elaborate process to prove that she refused submission to the Church or held heretical opinions. In the absence of writings or of witnesses the judges were obliged to depend on her own answers for reaching a decision in her case. Her referring her words and actions in one instance, when sorely pressed, to the Church Triumphant in Heaven, from which she believed she had received so many revelations to guide her in all her words and deeds, furnished indeed, when considered apart from all her other answers and sayings and the faithful practice all her life of her religious duties, a semblance of proof that she disregarded the authority of the Church Militant on earth. It does not require a theologian to declare this noble burst of confidence on her part in the Church Triumphant utterly inconclusive as regards the question of heresy, in view of all the circumstances. A large number of witnesses testified as to her submission to the Church both before and after her capture. Brother Ysambard de la Pierre, a Dominican of the convent at Rouen, on examination said: "On one occasion I with many others admonished and besought Jeanne to submit to the Church. To which she replied she would willingly submit to the Holy Father, requesting to be taken before him and to be no more submitted to the judgment of her enemies. And when at this time I counselled her to submit to the Council of Bale, Jeanne asked what a general council was. I answered her that it was an assembly of the whole Church Universal and of Christendom, and that in this council there were some of her side as well as of the English side. Having heard and understood this, she began to cry: 'Oh! if in that place there are any of our side I am quite willing to give myself up and to submit to the Council of Bale.' And immediately in great rage and indignation the Bishop of Beauvais began to call out: 'Hold your tongue, in the devil's name,' and told the notary he was to be careful to make no note of the submission she had made to the Council of Bale. On account of these things and many others, the English and their officers threatened me terribly, so that, had I not kept silent, they would have thrown me into the Seine." Further on he says: "The Bishop of Avaranches summoned me before him and asked me what St. Thomas said touching submission to the

Church. I sent the decision of St. Thomas in writing to the Bishop: 'In doubtful things touching the faith recourse should always be had to the Pope or a general council.' The good Bishop was of this opinion, and seemed to be far from content with the deliberations that had been made on this subject. His deliberation was not put into writing, it was left out, with bad intent." This witness also says on a second examination: "When the Bishop of Beauvais asked if she would submit to the Church she inquired: 'What is the Church? So far as it is you I will not submit to your judgment, because you are my deadly enemy.' When she was asked whether she would submit to the judgment of the Pope she replied that if they would take her to him she would be content. During the greater part of the process, when she was asked to submit to the Church, she understood by that term the assembly of judges and assessors there present. It was then explained to her by Maitre Pierre Maurice, and after she knew she always declared that she wished to submit to the Pope and to be conducted to him."

Maitre Richard Woudiet testified as follows: "I saw and heard at the trial when Jeanne was asked if she would submit to the Bishop of Beauvais and others of the assessors then named, she replied that she would not, but she would submit to the Pope and the Catholic Church, praying that she might be conducted to the Pope."

Maitre Jean Beaupere, master in theology, canon of Rouen, testified that "on the scaffold she said 'she placed all her deeds and words in the ordering of Our Holy Mother Church, and especially of the ecclesiastical judges,' being thereto requested by Maitre Nicolas Midi."

Messire Pierre Leboudier testified that "after the preaching at Saint Ouen Jeanne, with her hands joined together, said in a loud voice that she submitted to the judgment of the Church and prayed to Saint Michael that he would direct and counsel her."

M. Chevallier, who has written an exhaustive treatise, published in 1902, on the abjuration, made these conclusions: "(1) The formula of abjuration inserted in the process is not that which was read to the Maid and which she signed. (2) The authentic formula did not constitute in the view of common law an abjuration in regard to the faith. (3) In making it Jeanne did contradict and abandon her voices, but her act lacked the essential conditions of knowledge and of will."

Jeanne's reluctance to answer some questions left her open to being accused by the hostile judges of condemning the authority of the Church, and therefore the Bishop of Beauvais and some of the assessors professed to regard her as a heretic on this account. Jeanne had learned to regard the Bishop of Beauvais and others of

the assembly who showed a bias against her as uncompromising enemies; she was wearied by their torrent of questions, many of which had been already answered by her, and it was only by her consummate legal skill that she was able to successfully parry their interrogations. Brother Ysambard on examination said: "Such difficult, subtle and crafty questions were asked of and proposed to poor Jeanne that the great clerics and learned people present would have found it hard to reply, and at the questions many of those present murmured."

The catechism of the Council of Trent defines a heretic as "one who, despising the authority of the Church which he has sufficient reason to believe is the true Church of Christ, contrary to its decision obstinately adheres to false and impious opinions."

Any fairly well instructed Catholic, reading all the answers and sayings of Jeanne as disclosed in the process, should have no serious difficulty in declaring her innocent of heresy within the meaning of this definition. A detached answer here and there torn from its context affords no fair grounds for judging her. If Jeanne's belief in her revelations had not been from the first a deep-rooted conviction, her wonderful exploits and unique experiences would have made it so. It was obedience, not impiety, that made her leave her parental roof to seek him whom she believed to be the rightful heir to the throne of France; that made her discard her female dress for the more fitting garb of an armed cavalier; that emboldened her to defy the might of Bedford's victorious hosts—obedience to what she believed was God's will. To denounce as impious the belief which had transformed Jeanne, the poor girl peasant, into the triumphant bearer of the *fleur-de-lis* seemed far less befitting the voice of the Church than the voice of the baffled enemies of France. Even apart from the circumstances which have given so much fame to Jeanne's revelations it would be hard to arrive at any infallible conclusion in regard to them. The sentence of rehabilitation pronounced in 1456 contains the following words in condemning the judgment given against Jeanne: "And because of the question of revelations it is most difficult to furnish a certain judgment, Blessed Paul having on the subject of his own revelations said that he knew not if they came to him in body or in spirit, and having on this point referred himself to God." It is true that ten witnesses are mentioned in the "Subsequent Examinations and Proceedings after the Relapse," which are not, however, included in the official text of the trial as having stated on oath before the judges that condemned Jeanne, that on the day she was put to death they heard her say in prison that the voices had deceived her, because they had promised she should be delivered from prison. One of these witnesses, Brother Martin Ladvenu, the

intrepid father who remained closest to her at the stake, the most fearless to speak to her there as a friend, deposed afterward in connection with the rehabilitation that "up to the end of her life she maintained and assented that her voices came from God, and that what she had done had been by God's command. She did not believe that her voices had deceived her, but that the revelations that she had received had come from God." It will be noticed that he uses the words "up to the end of her life," which may not be inclusive of the day on which Jeanne is said to have referred to the voices as having deceived her. The evidence of the ten witnesses is not signed by the three official registers, and it is unfortunate that it was not taken in Jeanne's presence instead of being taken after her death, as it concerned her materially. Manchon testifies that the Bishop of Beauvais "wanted to compel him to sign this evidence," but that he would not do so. He also testifies elsewhere on examination "that Jeanne never revoked her revelations, but maintained them to the end." It is rather singular also that M. Ladvenu in his later evidence regarding Jeanne's belief in her revelations did not qualify it by referring to the former evidence as to her saying in prison on the day of her death that the voices had deceived her in promising to deliver her from prison.

One of the ten witnesses who testified as to what she said on the last day in prison said he heard her declare, in addition to what is above stated to have been then said by her, that to know whether her voices "were good or evil spirits she referred to the clergy." Another said Jeanne, being on that occasion asked if her voices and apparitions proceeded from good or evil spirits, did reply: "I know not; I wait on my Mother the Church, or I wait on you who are the Church." In view of all the circumstances, the unofficial testimony of the ten witnesses as to what the prisoner said when not on guard as on her trial, and which seems indirectly contradictory by one of them, cannot be considered as decisive of the question as to whether she at last disbelieved in the voices, much less of the question as to whether the voices were good or evil. A fair inference from all these facts is that she reiterated her belief in her revelations at the time of her execution.

On the subject of Jeanne's relapse, which occasioned a second process, the text after reciting that the judges repaired to the prison, reads: "And because Jeanne was dressed in the dress of a man, that is to say, a short mantle, a hood, a doublet and other effects used by men, although by our orders she had several days before consented to give up these garments, we asked her when and for what reason she had resumed this dress." Jeanne answered: "I have but now resumed the dress of a man and put off the woman's dress."

After being pressed to give the reason for resuming her man's dress after having recanted her alleged errors, which included the wearing of the male attire, according to the authentic act of abjuration, she answered: "Because it is more lawful and suitable for me to resume it and to wear man's dress, being with men, than to have a woman's dress. I have resumed it because the promise made to me has not been kept; that is to say, that I should go to Mass and receive my Saviour, and that I should be taken out of irons." "One of her answers then was that she took the dress of a man of her own free will and with no constraint; that she preferred a man's dress to a woman's dress." The Dominican Brothers Ysambard and Martin Ladvenu testified that she informed them that she was obliged to take a man's dress because she found it necessary to do so as for protection against violence and insult.

The two processes, the first and the second, are also designated in the text of the trial as the "Lapse and Relapse," but the two are conveniently referred to as the process. The sentence of rehabilitation condemns and annuls both processes in the strongest terms, such as follows: "We say, pronounce, decree and declare the said processes and sentences full of cozenage, iniquity, inconsequence and manifest errors, in fact as well as in law."

There is abundance of evidence of bias on the part of the judges at the trial. Suppression of evidence and admission of improper evidence abounded. Violence and intimidation also more or less prevailed. Manchon testified on examination as follows: "At the beginning of the trial, because I was putting in writing for five or six days the answers and excuses of the said Maid, the judges several times wished to compel me, speaking in Latin, to put them in other terms by changing the sense of her words or in other ways such as I had not heard. By command of the Bishop of Beauvais two men were placed at the window near where the judges sat, with a curtain across the window so that they could not be seen. These two men wrote and reported what there was in the charge against Jeanne, keeping silence as to her excuses, and in my opinion one of these was Loyseleur. After the sitting was over in the afternoon, while comparing notes of what had been written, the two others reported differently from me and had put in none of the excuses, at which my Lord of Beauvais was greatly angry with me. Where nota is written in the process there was disagreement and questions had to be made upon it, and it was found that what I had written was true. In writing the said process I was often opposed by my Lord of Beauvais and the masters, who wanted to compel me to write according to their fancy and against what I had myself heard. And when there was something which did not please them they forbade it to

be written, saying that it did not serve the process; but I nevertheless wrote only according to my hearing and knowledge.

"This witness also testifies that through the confidence reposed in Maitre Nicolas Loyseleur by Jeanne, whom he was in the habit of visiting in prison as a pretended friend, her familiar conversations were reported, as Manchon thought, to the notaries. And from this were made memoranda for questions in the trial to find some way of catching her unawares."

Maitre Gillaume de Lachambre, master in arts and medicine, testified partly as follows: "I gave no opinion during the trial, but allowed myself to affix my signature under compulsion from the Bishop of Beauvais. I made excuses to him that in these matters it did not belong to my profession to give any opinion. However, finally the Bishop forced me to subscribe as others had done, saying that otherwise some ill would befall me for having come to Rouen. I say, too, that threats were also used against Master Jean Lohier and Maitre Nicolas de Houppeville, who, not wishing to take part in the trial, were threatened with the penalty of drowning."

The Dominicans also testified to the beautiful death of Jeanne, who used many pious ejaculations and died "like Saint Ignatius and many other martyrs," uttering the name of Jesus.

The first movement towards Jeanne's rehabilitation was made by the French King Charles VII., at whose request the University of Paris inquired in 1450 into the questions and circumstances pertaining to her trial and execution. But no final judgment was pronounced by the court that sat on the inquiry owing, it is stated, to political expediency, which shrank at offending England by a proceeding originated by the King of France.

In 1452 Pope Nicholas V., appealed to by Jeanne's mother, ordered an inquiry, which, however, like the former, was not completed. In 1455 Pope Nicholas died, and the d'Arc family looked to his successor, Calixtus III., for the furtherance of the inquiry, and their wishes were graciously acceded to. On the 7th of November, 1455, the proceedings for Jeanne's rehabilitation opened at Paris in obedience to the Papal rescript. But the case lingered on by reason of various adjournments of sittings, such delays being deemed necessary in order to give an ample opportunity for any of the representatives of the deceased Bishop Beauvais and associate judges at the trial of Jeanne, and as well the promoter d'Estivet to present themselves. The petition, however, remained unopposed and the case was finally proceeded with on February 16, 1456. The preliminary objections taken at the first meeting at Paris to the proceedings at the trial of Jeanne were formulated, according to Mr. Murray, as follows:

(1) The intervention of the hidden registrars and the alterations, additions and omissions made in the twelve articles. (2) The suppression of the preliminary inquiry, that is the Domrémy evidence taken, and the obvious predisposition of the judges. (3) The incompetence of the court and the unfairness received throughout by the accused, culminating in an illegal sentence and an irregular execution. It is further stated by Mr. Murray that the inquiry of 1456 extended over several months. Twenty-four witnesses were heard in January and February at Domrémy and Vacouleurs; forty-one in February and in March at Orleans; twenty at Paris in April and May; nineteen at Rouen in December and May.

By the evidence of so many witnesses the character of Jeanne d'Arc is photographed more plainly to the world than if she was a very familiar, living acquaintance. We see her exemplary life from her childhood up to the time of her capture at Compeigne; her marvelous prowess and success in raising the siege of Orleans; her influence for good over the French army that followed her as their ideal of a leader in war; her incarceration in the enemy's prisons, the gloom of her trial, condemnation and death silver-lined by her saintly patience and fortitude to the end. The charges of divination and sorcery, based upon alleged dealings with the fairies near the "Fairy Tree," vanish into the air before the extolling testimony of the simple peasant folk of Domrémy. The formidable fabric of dark accusation built up by her enemies topples to the ground as writer after writer tells the beautiful story of how and where she lived after leaving Domrémy.

The sentence of rehabilitation utterly annulling the judgment against Jeanne was pronounced by the judges on the 7th of June, 1456. In reference to the twelve articles drawn up against Jeanne and submitted to the University of Paris they say: "In the first place, we say, and because justice requires it we declare, that the articles beginning with the words 'a woman,' which are found inserted in the pretended process and instrument of the pretended sentences lodged against the said deceased, ought to have been, have been and are extracted from the said pretended process and the said pretended confessions of the said deceased with corruption, cozenage, calumny, fraud and malice. We declare that on certain points the truth of her confessions has been passed over in silence; that on other points her confessions have been falsely translated, etc., etc.

"We declare that in those articles there have been added without right many aggravating circumstances which are not in the aforesaid confessions, and many circumstances both relevant and justifying have been passed over in silence. We declare that even the

form of certain words has been altered in such a manner as to change the substance."

In like manner they condemn the process or "lapse" and "relapse." Thus was the Maid of Orleans vindicated within about a quarter of a century after her death.

Who can do full justice to the subject, a story whose sublime pathos has never been exceeded even in the annals of France, replete with national tragedies, over which the world had mourned? When all that was mortal of the Maid of Orleans had disappeared forever from human vision, when the relentless flames kindled by the vindictiveness of the secular power, to whose unsparing vengeance she had been ruthlessly consigned, had done their work and her spirit was seen soaring away from France in the form of a white dove, the hostile spectators of this final scene in the old Market Place of Rouen became their own self-accusers. In their heart of hearts they acknowledged their crime. Too late. Only time in its undeviating onward march could right the wrong. And it was not slow to do so. How consoling it is to remember that the Church shows the care of a mother for the good name of her children while ever solicitous for their eternal welfare!

A greater, a sublimer vindication of Joan's life is the process of her beatification, which began in January, 1904. The process necessarily implies a belief in her exalted virtues and concedes the truth of her praises by a host of writers.

Some of the present day infidels of France profess to see nothing higher in the wonderful career of Joan of Arc than her patriotism, to which they attribute all her military enthusiasm at Orleans and Patay, accompanied by her extraordinary success. They sneer with Voltaire at her "voices," although compelled to honor her for the brilliancy of her deeds on the battlefield, which enthused all France. How strange that the patriotism which had redeemed France in the hour of her extremest peril should have found lodgment alone in the breast of a girl but entering her teens, absolutely illiterate, and whose world should ordinarily have been the isolated hamlet of Domrémy! Was there not another in all France or Lorraine more fitted for the noise of battle and the flash of arms? Was there no other on whose brow could as well be wreathed the laurels of a nation's victory? None so blind as those who will not see. Truth to tell, "the cold abstraction of patriotism she never discovered for herself," as one of her admirers, Thomas Davidson, aptly wrote. She was moved by far different influences than those of patriotism or ambition—by her tender pity for the oppressed, her fresh young sympathy with the Dauphin and, above all, by her firm belief in her divine commission as she conceived it. To act for the future, to

read its secrets with the keenest vision of a prophet as if unveiled from the present, is not the mere patriot's attribute. Without chart or compass, book or pen, perfectly heedless of military glory for its own sake and supported at first by a mere remnant of soldiers regarding her with distrust if not scorn, she displayed an ardor and self-confidence hitherto unknown to the greatest generals of England or France. And as to her military skill, notwithstanding her utter lack of training or experience in the art of war, there is abundance of unimpeachable testimony. Such, for instance, as that of the Duke d'Alençon and that of Thibauld d'Armagnac.

The relief of Orleans and the crowning of the King at Rheims was her express mission, according to the records of history. To unite the discordant interests of a nation, to arouse a spirit of exalted patriotism, for the want of which France was perishing, to turn back the tide of English invasion, to reprove the corruptions and immoralities of court and camp, to bear witness to the might of the God of Arms—this was the larger mission of the noble, the immortal peasant girl of Domrémy.

A. J. McGillivray.

Ottawa, Ont.

---

## THE WITNESS OF CONSCIENCE TO THE EXISTENCE OF GOD.

THE fact that the main argument which is urged at least in modern times by non-Catholic theists to prove the existence of God is that from the moral order renders an examination of the argument a matter of some importance.

This is the more necessary, for Catholic apologists on the other hand fight shy of the argument as a rule, and rest their case entirely on one or other of the five cosmological proofs of St. Thomas. In the first place, then, we shall define the precise phase of the argument that will engage our attention. We shall then endeavor to show that the argument, far from being a modern one made in Germany by Kant, is in reality bound up with and essential to the truth of certain universally received views in Catholic theology; and finally we shall endeavor to show that the argument cannot be explained away on Utilitarian lines.

### I.

The argument from the moral order is presented in two ways: First, in contending that many of the precepts of that order are

absolutely necessary; that their existence is inconceivable in any hypothesis, and hence that they cannot rest in any way on the fleeting things of time, but must have as their ultimate basis some necessary immutable being "with whom there is no change nor shadow of alteration." Viewed in this way, the argument from the moral order merges in and is identical with that derived from the existence of necessary truths in general.

The other form of the argument is that alone with which we shall concern ourselves—namely, that the notion of obligation which arises in the mind when the performance of certain actions and the omission of certain others occur to us, and the correlative sense of self-esteem or reproof, according as we have been faithful to the obligation or the reverse, prove the existence of some extra mundane being who imposes and sanctions the obligation. This intellectual perception of a duty and of self-complacency or fear, according as we have performed or neglected it, is conscience, at once the norm and sanction of morality.

Our opponents are two-fold: First, those who hold (and many Catholics are numbered amongst them) that the idea of obligation comes to us from without; in a word, that it is traditional. It is our thesis against them that obligation is a primary perception and arises in our minds spontaneously without previous knowledge of God or the moral order. Our argument is impugned in the second place by those who, while admitting these feelings of obligation and consequent retribution, attempt to explain them on Utilitarian principles and without any reference to an extra mundane legislator who has impressed his law on our minds.

## II.

Against the first class of opponents we admit that this conception of obligation is immature, and that without the aid of others men generally could not explain the genesis of obligation nor even formally recognize it as such. But we contend that on the bare contemplation of certain acts, the conscience of one who has attained the use of reason revolts from them without the previous apprehension of God or the application of any general principle of morality, the recognition of which is not a spontaneous process, but is subsequent and reflexive. As an easy deduction from this shrinking of conscience and from the subsequent remorse and fear, if he has outraged his conscience, the average man in our opinion first reaches the knowledge of God as some superior outside himself whom he has offended. For the presence of a negative obligation or one that has been transgressed is, considering the bent of mind of men generally, much more likely to awaken this knowledge than a posi-

tive one or one that has been performed. "Stern daughter of the voice of God" is not all a metaphor, and the man who has experienced the imperious dictate of conscience has been apprised of the presence of the divinity in his inner nature—"that God is not far from every one of us."

Of course it is true that before any pronouncement of conscience a child of good Christian parents is likely to have heard of God, but that he will have any true conception of Him—any realization of what God is—till conscience reveals Him as sanctioning certain acts is, we contend, very improbable. Similarly such a child will have been told that certain actions are evil and that he must not do them, as God would punish him; but it is almost impossible that a child of tender years and of average precocity could assimilate the ideas of morality and of obligation unless they were first united in some way and the admonition of the external mentor enforced by the imperative dictate of conscience.

Those who endeavor to overthrow our argument on this first line of attack, viz.: That our first ideas of God and of obligation are, as it were, echoes of what we have heard from others—are, I think, principally Catholics, for Protestants as a rule admit the validity of the argument from conscience. And one of the principal dogmas of unbelievers is that morality and obligation are quite separable from a belief in God and, in fact, are found separate in the lower strata of civilization. Hence they bend all their energies to explain the problem of conscience on Utilitarian lines, and we shall see what is to be said for this view later on. Our opponents here, then, being Catholics, we are justified in repelling the attack by an appeal to Catholic principles. But first it might be well to give in a summary way an argument that applies generally.

In ancient paganism the objects of worship, such as Bacchus, Neptune, Mercury, Pluto, were often immoral as well as false—demons and nothing else—and yet dishonesty was banned, purity was honored if not generally practised, and ascetics were admired if not imitated. Manifestly, then, the popular and traditional cult of the gods was in no way responsible for this involuntary homage to virtue. Nothing can account for it but the guiding light of conscience, which, in spite of external authority, led those that were docile to its behests away unsmirched through the quagmires of paganism to the throne of One All Holy God.

To come now to arguments that are distinctively Catholic, I would urge in the first place the almost universally accepted view[1] in our theology that no adult can be ignorant of the existence of God except through his own fault. The question then we have to face

[1] See Mazzella de Deo (College Class-Book).

at once is: Whence is this knowledge derived? In a great many cases, of course, it can be and is derived from tradition—the oral teaching of parents, clergymen and those intrusted with our education. In these cases we reasonably assent to the existence of God on their authority. But in some cases such reasonable assent is precluded. Take, for instance, the children of agnostics[2] educated in an unbelieving atmosphere. They cannot derive the knowledge of God that they are supposed by us to have in this way; on the contrary, a very powerful proof is necessary in their case to overcome authority backed up by prejudice and inherited tendencies. Where is such proof to be sought? Not, we believe, in the five great proofs elaborated by St. Thomas, for no one would say that such persons are incapable of serious moral delinquency until they have had sufficient training to weigh and appreciate the force of these arguments. Even granting them mental capacity sufficiently evolved for this task, if we try to create for ourselves their mental atmosphere we shall realize that such speculative proofs would be quite inadequate to overcome the efforts of early training, for Suarez admits that even for specialists some of these proofs are slippery and uncertain.

Besides, it was St. Thomas' own opinion that a person entirely sequestered from society would nevertheless attain to a knowledge of God. And great probability is lent to this view by the action of the Fathers of the Vatican Council in rejecting from their canon about the knowledge of the existence of God the limitation that some proposed, viz.: That it applied only to those in normal circumstances—"in societate adulta." And we make bold to say that the argument from contingency or the impossibility of an infinite series would never suggest itself to a person thus isolated. And the same would probably be true of the argument from design—having no previous knowledge of an extra mundane being, the Romulus in question would probably take things as he found them without inquiry as to their origin. Of course, the case would be quite different if he had a previous knowledge of God; then the aspect of external nature would be to him all that is claimed for it in the Acts of the Apostles and the Book of Wisdom.

Another point in this theory about unbelievers that makes for our view is the fact that sin is considered to be effective in destroying the knowledge of God, so that all admit that there are many speculative atheists consequent on the commission of habitual sin at least. There is an explanation of this fact on the theory that knowledge of God is dependent on conscience, for conscience is a delicate flower that easily loses its bloom; it is singularly liable to be choked by

[2] "Principles of Moral Science."

cockle, and has no congenial soil in the hard hearts of the unregenerate. It is a small, weak voice, and if its admonitions are constantly set at nought it will eventually become still in moral death. The sinner, then, has ignored the law, and with it vanishes all knowledge of the legislator. The atheistic whisper in the fool's heart that the Psalmist speaks of is the price of moral rather than of intellectual folly. For if the knowledge of God is not derived from conscience there is no reason why the sinner should be in a worse plight than the just man, because God does not deprive man of his natural powers as a result of sin. And as for grace, no one would say that it is necessary for a man who had already attained the knowledge of God to preserve that knowledge, and if he already did not know God he could not be punished by the deprivation of medicinal grace, for his sin was ex-hypothesi purely philosophic, in no way directed against God.

Nor is this opinion—that no adult can be an atheist prior to the commission of sin—though not perhaps a matter of strict obligation in our theology, to be lightly set aside. Witness the emphatic words of St. Paul in the second chapter of the Epistle to the Romans, where he seems to allude to our argument. Besides, this possibility of the universal diffusion of the knowledge of God seems alone in harmony with His salvific will; indeed, it is almost demanded by our sense of what is becoming and in consonance with the divine beneficence that God would implant in the heart of each one the light of His holy countenance and the first principles of His sacred law, so that entirely irrespective of circumstances the individual adult could have access to the temple of mercy and grace.

Another point in our theology that supposes the validity of the argument from conscience to God is the reiterated assertion of the Fathers that a knowledge of God is innate (insita[3]) in all men. This tenet can be maintained only by an appeal to conscience or on the theory of innate ideas. For it is absurd to say (having the ordinary faithful in mind) that the cosmological arguments for the existence of God are so tangible and so much a matter of course that we may be said to have an innate idea of His existence. Nor do the Fathers allude to magisterial knowledge, as will appear to any one giving a cursory glance—say through Franzelin,[4] where he gives excerpts from their works dealing with the matter.

Again, our contention seems to be borne out in all our theologies, sermons and popular addresses where we invariably assume that the function of conscience is dictatorial and not merely directive, a

[3] "Haec est vis verae divinitatis, ut creaturae rationali jam ratione utenti non omnino possit abscondi."—St. Augustine, in Joan Tract, 106.

[4] De Deo Uno, p. 64.

law and hence connoting a legislator, and not a mere statement of fact. Suarez brings this out very clearly—de Legibus, B. II., C. V.

Finally the validity of our argument, in my opinion, follows irresistibly on Catholic principles from the thesis condemned by Alexander VIII. in reference to philosophic sin, all the special pleading to the contrary notwithstanding. To vindicate the theory of philosophic sin from this condemnation, it is sought to show that the Pope might have condemned the proposition because the terms of it were of sufficient latitude to include the assertion that a person not *actually* adverting to the existence of God or ignorant of Him through *his own fault* would be guilty only of philosophic sin. But did any one ever advance either of these two assertions? Popes in their utterances are not beating the air any more than other men, and a condemnation always supposes some question that was mooted at the moment. And the question at issue when this famous proposition was condemned was undoubtedly not the reality of philosophic sin when there was no *actual* advertence, but the possibility of philosophic sin in any case.[5] Besides, if the Pope meant to condemn these illegitimate extensions of the theory and them merely, the first part of the proposition would be entirely irrelevant.

## III.

We now come to the proof of our thesis against the Utilitarian philosophy of which we will take Mr. Spencer as the chief exponent. Bentham questioned the legitimacy of the facts of conscience and obligation; but his disciples, wiser in their generation, admit them and work them for all they are worth; but at the same time they deny the validity of the theistic argument based on them. It is very hard indeed to see how any one could, without jeopardy to all his knowledge, deny the existence of this great "beacon light" (as Browning calls conscience)—at once the subjective rule of morality and one of its highest sanctions. For it confessedly exists,[6] even among the most degraded and uncultured, and in matters, too, in which one would think that the allurements of sense would be most likely to hush its promptings.

For the purpose of our present argument it matters not at all that its monitions differ in the case of different individuals; our only concern is to show that conscience and a sense of expediency are not now and could not have been in the remote past convertible terms.

Mr. Spencer, then, admits that "ought" represents a fact of moral consciousness as man is here and now constituted, though when the millennium comes he expects that it will be dispensed with. It is

[5] "Principles of Moral Science," p. 121.

[6] Tylor, II., 360.

none of our business now to blur in any way his roseate forecast as to the future of the race. In his view duty consists mainly of two elements—the element of authoritativeness and the element of coerciveness, which would correspond, I suppose, to its judicial and executive functions in the ordinary view. The element of authoritativeness has arisen from the fact "that the accumulated experiences of the race have produced the consciousness that guidance by feelings which refer to remote and general results is usually more conducive to welfare than guidance by feelings to be immediately gratified."[7] But why this should generate the authority implied in the idea of obligation is not apparent. To have regard to remote and general results does not imply morality. One may restrain himself from gratifying immediate feelings in order to gratify them more effectually in the future. Nay, he may sacrifice them for the moment, and yet all the time in the present and in the future may transgress every rule of morality. A robber may scorn pleasure and live laborious days, may spend money in buying the implements of his craft in order that in due time he may the more easily rob a bank or break into a house. Is it anything less than ridiculous, in face of such facts, to say that the having regard to future consequences rather than immediate ones accounts for the element of authority in conscience? But Mr. Spencer will rejoin that the remote consequences he has in mind as generating the element of authority are the consequences not to the individual himself, but to the race. But perish the race, why should I be bound to provide for its well-being? What claim has it on me? This will appear more clearly when we have considered the other element in duty.

The element of coerciveness in conscience was at first derived from the fear of punishment according to Spencer. The fear of punishment, he says, is the permanent motive of the savage. If we ask how this becomes the coercive element of duty among civilized people in the Utilitarian theory, we happen on the great weak point of their system—the attempt to bridge the chasm between the individual and the race. The savage, according to Spencer, refrains from scalping his enemy because he is afraid of the anger of the chief. This restraint, however, arising from the "extrinsic" effects of an action, is not, we are told, yet moral. The moral restraint arises when we refrain from slaying because of the intrinsic effects of the action.

These intrinsic effects are of the following kind: "The infliction of death agony on the victim, the destruction of all his possibilities of happiness, the entailed sufferings to his belongings."[8]

[7] "Data of Ethics," I., 126.
[8] "Data of Ethics," I., 120.

The ground of restraint in the case of the savage is the fear of future pain to himself. With the evolutionist it is concern for the pleasures and pains of others. How is the transition made? Has the restraint which makes a man honest from fear of the gallows any mode of transforming itself into the disinterested restraint which guides his action by regard to the well-being of other people? What is the unifying principle between him and the race? That a consciousness of universal kinship among the members of the human race is not such a principle any one in the least acquainted with the world will admit. Whether or not such a happy state of universal brotherhood will obtain in the future does not matter in the least, for a future contingency cannot account for the existing facts of the moral order.

Perhaps law, as Bain holds, is the benign influence smoothing the rugged path from egoism to altruism.

According to Bain society, by means of government or otherwise, inflicts punishment upon such actions as interfere with the pleasures or increase the pains of men, and then association being established in the mind between punishable actions and punishment, men come to dread and avoid such actions. In this view conscience would be simply a miniature police court.

The inadequacy of this means of effecting the transition is evident from this fact alone that human law can reach only external and overt acts, and I think it is fair to assume that if there was no direct check on internal desires they would issue forth in a wild torrent that would utterly demolish the tiny dam of the mere human legislator.

This contention gains strength from the consideration that human law is often uncertain in its operations, and that its penalties are often trivial, though the gain, *e. g.,* of harassing one's neighbors, be very considerable. And what we have said about law applies *totidem verbis* to public opinion, which Spencer calls the social element in thecoerciveness of conscience. Besides, it is quite evident that Bain's theory makes no pretence to account for a great part of morality, especially its positive precepts and many obligations under the virtue of chastity.

Nor will the religious factor—the fear of God—that Spencer recognizes as helping to make us altruistic serve his turn any better unless on the hypothesis we are contending for, viz.: That the facts of conscience are a valid argument for God's existence. Because, as we have said in the beginning, the theology of paganism, for instance, was little calculated to have any restraining influence on the passions of men. And again in this matter Spencer is easily hoist with his own petard and that of his friends, for they are forever

proclaiming the comcomitant existence of morality with the want of religious belief among the primitive races.

The chasm, then, between the individual and the race is impossible on Utilitarian principles, and evolutionists ought either to abandon their altruistic cant or give up their theory of the determination of the will to the most enticing object. Having shown, then, that on Utilitarian principles our fellow-members of the race have very little connection with our acts, it follows as a matter of course that Spencer's attempted explanation of the elements of authority and coerciveness breaks down.

There is another weak point in the Utilitarian theory that I think is not sufficiently insisted on. For in the view of Spencer, Darwin and evolutionists generally the principles of morality are nothing more than the concentrated and crystallized experiences of the race making for the survival of the fittest, of which our physical organism is the receptacle and which have been transmitted to us with it. In this way they claim that a man can and must in certain circumstances, owing to the bent of his character, reject some course of action that would otherwise be for him an irresistible attraction, thereby sacrificing the pleasure of the individual to the well-being of the race or in other words to morality.

But if such be the genesis of morality, how can the Utilitarians account for the fact that as children we do some things habitually that we afterwards refrain from as habitually and that are recognized as detrimental to the race? This undoubted fact shows, since the constitution of the child and the adult is the same, that the racial experiences of utility or the reverse have quite a subordinate place in regulating the conduct of men generally.

Besides, I think it is fair to urge that if morality is identical with the accumulated experiences of each one's progenitors there would not be such unanimity among us as to its precepts. For our antecedents were in many cases very different, and a policy that proved suicidal to one would doubtless often have been the making of another.

Again, there are certain acts which are universally recognized as being right and of obligation, and we much doubt if on the principles of natural selection or the survival of the fittest their utility to the race would entitle them to the high place they now hold in the estimation of men. Let us examine, for instance, whether it is possible to account for the generally recognized obligation to be truthful on the Utilitarian hypothesis.

If morality can be deduced from the laws of life and the conditions of existence, we have a right to expect that the biological conditions which spelled success in the lower sphere should also

obtain in the higher. We find, however, that with nearly all creatures up to man a premium is put on deception. It is the weapon which the weak use against the strong; indeed, often the only effective one they have. Any work on natural history will afford illustration of the truth of the statement that deception is almost universal and has on it the stamp of success and so of moral obligation on Utilitarian principles. The flatfish which escapes the jaws of the dogfish is the one which can imitate most closely the color of the sand bank on which it lies. Some of the most remarkable mimetic insects yet discovered are certain bugs which have a most striking resemblance to thorns. One species in particular, the umbonia spinosa in South Africa, is an exact imitation of a large thorn such as is found upon a wild rose stem. The counterfeit is so thorough that to discover the umbonia on a thorny stem seems a task of which no bird would be capable.

We need not multiply instances which will readily occur to every one. Imitation, mimicry, deception prevail everywhere in the animal kingdom from the least to the highest, from the insect to the mother bird, which moves as if her wings were broken to entice the pursuer from her nest.

This process of deception has the sanction of success. Those who have been best at it have escaped the danger before which their less skillful relatives went down, and organized deception becomes the fit rule of conduct for all who have survived. It is preposterous to think that out of this biological law of life there should have been evolved the supreme authority and obligation of truthfulness in the case of man; and remember that it does not make any difference to our position that the obligation of truthfulness is questioned by some evolutionists provided it be admitted (and what I think is unquestionable) that the generality of men recognize it.

Even when we turn to human life it cannot be shown on the hypothesis of evolution that the habit of telling the truth is beneficial, pleasurable or advantageous. The Utilitarian sanction for veracity is neither powerful nor universal. Few laws enforce it, nor is the social reprobation attaching to untruthfulness as such very severe. For though it is true that we profess indignation at deceit generally, as a matter of fact we are really angry only when the deceit is malicious or injurious to us. We resist calumny, cheating and hypocrisy because they harm us, not at all because they are untrue. Abstract the detraction and the mischief from the untruth, and we are at little pains to condemn it; let it take the direction of adulation, and people generally are pleased with it, and but for their modesty would applaud it.

We can find no basis, then, for the obligation of being truthful

in biological conditions or in the experience of men, and hence Utilitarianism utterly fails to account for it. And the same is demonstrably true in the case of other obligations, for instance, our respect for the lives of the aged and helpless whose maintenance is a burden to us, not to mention at all the plague-stricken and others whose very existence is a positive menace to society.[9]

The truth is, of course, that Utilitarianism leaves out of sight the greater part of morality. That theory of morals and of obligation is by its apotheosis of the creature not only dwarfed, it is lop-sided. Our relation to our fellow-men is incidental and secondary in the true scheme of morality. We are under an obligation to avoid injuring our neighbors, but in our opinion, with all due deference to the great authorities on the other side,[10] the ratio formalis of such obligation is the Divine Will exclusively. The many Catholics that hold a different view seem to be admitting the thin end of the wedge of Utilitarianism. God was bound, seeing that He had made men independent of one another, to sanction with His will certain relations between them; but if we trespass on the independence of our neighbors, though no doubt we violate their right, still our moral culpability consists formally not at all in the injury we do them, but in our violation of the Divine law.

It is to be noted, too, that in expounding the principles of ethics we explain what kind of life we ought to live, what end to accomplish; we say not merely thou shalt not, but thou shalt. So that even if we were to reach the time and state when it would be no longer necessary to say thou shalt not, the notion of obligation would remain and would make itself felt so long as there was a further progress to be made, a higher ideal to reach and a further end to be accomplished.

And remember that according to the evolutionists at least the ideal of human conduct is continually growing and seeking a higher statement and embodiment of itself as knowledge widens. Neither, then, by the attempt to resolve it into its elements nor by the prediction that it will fade away have Spencer and his friends succeeded in divorcing the idea of a Supreme Personal Lawgiver from our sense of moral obligation.

In conclusion, we contend that we have proved against many Catholics that on our own principles the knowledge of obligation, and hence of God to some extent, is assumed as a primary fact of consciousness—is something arising spontaneously within the mind and independent of external instruction as to its existence, though not perhaps as to its perfection. We have refuted evolutionists

[9] "Principles of Moral Science," 75.
[10] "Principles of Moral Science," 61.

who take up the same position by retorting on them their own theory as to the atheism of the lower races, and by showing that in paganism the traditional cult of the Gods had no beneficial influence at least on the morality of the people.

We may assume, I think (what seems a mere truism), that the sense of obligation does not arise from anything we owe our own individual natures, and we have tried to show against Utilitarians that it has no reference to the race in general and so has no *raison d'être* at all on empirical lines.

We are entitled, therefore, to assume that this better self within us represents and bears unmistakable evidence to the existence of the living God, who, though greater than conscience, speaks through conscience. Conscience, then, occupies the throne of the universe, and her voice is that of the eternal king to which all loyal subjects respond with rejoicing assent, and with the exulting hope that the right will triumph, they rejoice that God reigns forever in righteousness, and that the puny arguments of atheists will one day dissolve and melt away like the snowflake on a river.

> Stern Lawgiver! yet thou dost wear
> The Godhead's most benignant grace;
> Nor knew we anything so fair
> As is the smile upon thy face.
> —Wordsworth's Ode "On Duty."

D. Barry.

Ireland.

---

## BASIL VALENTINE, A GREAT PRE-REFORMATION CHEMIST.

THE Protestant tradition which presumes *a priori* that no good can possibly have come out of the Nazareth of the times before the Reformation, and especially the immediately preceding century, has served to obscure to an unfortunate degree the history of several hundred years extremely important in every department of education. Strange as it may seem to those unfamiliar with the period, it is in that department which is supposed to be so typically modern—the physical sciences—that this neglect is most serious. Such a hold has this Protestant tradition on even educated minds that it is a source of great surprise to most people to be told that there were in many parts of Europe original observers in the physical sciences all during the thirteenth, fourteenth and fifteenth centuries who were doing ground-breaking work of the highest value that was destined to mean much for the development of modern

science. Speculations and experiments with regard to the philosopher's stone and the transmutation of metals are supposed to fill up all the interests of the alchemists of those days. As a matter of fact, however, men were making original observations of very profound significance, and these were considered so valuable by their contemporaries that though printing had not yet been invented, even the immense labor involved in copying large folio volumes by hand did not suffice to deter them from multiplying the writings of these men and thus preserving them for future generations until the printing press came to perpetuate them.

At the beginning of the twentieth century, with some of the supposed foundations of modern chemistry crumbling to pieces, under the influences of the peculiarly active light thrown upon older chemical theories by the discovery of radium and the radio active elements generally, there is a reawakening of interest in some of the old-time chemical observers whose work used to be laughed at as so unscientific and whose theory of the transmutation of elements into one another was considered so absurd. The idea that it would be impossible under any circumstances to convert one element into another belongs entirely to the nineteenth century. Even so distinguished a mind as that of Newton, in the preceding century, could not bring itself to acknowledge the modern supposition of the absurdity of metallic transformation, but, on the contrary, believed very firmly in this as a basic chemical principle and confessed that it might be expected to occur at any time. He had seen specimens of gold ores in connection with metallic copper, and had concluded that this was a manifestation of the natural transformation of one of these yellow metals into the other.

With the discovery that radium transforms itself into helium, and that indeed all the so-called radio activities of the very heavy metals are probably due to a natural transmutation process constantly at work, the ideas of the older chemists cease entirely to be a subject for amusement. The physical chemists of the present day are very ready to admit that the old teaching of the absolute independence of something over seventy elements is no longer tenable, except as a working hypothesis. The doctrine of matter and form taught for so many centuries by the scholastic philosophers that all matter is composed of two principles, an underlying material substratum and a dynamic or informing principle, has now more acknowledged verisimilitude or lies at least closer to the generally accepted ideas of the most progressive scientists than it has at any time for the last two or three centuries. Not only the great physicists, but the great chemists, are speculating along lines that suggest the existence of but one form of matter modified according to the energies that

it possesses under a varying physical and chemical environment. This is after all only a restatement in modern terms of the teaching of St. Thomas in the thirteenth century.

It is not surprising, then, that there should be a reawakening of interest in the lives of some of the men who, dominated by the earlier scholastic ideas and by the tradition of the possibility of finding the philosopher's stone, which would transmute the baser metals into the precious metals, devoted themselves with quite as much zeal as any modern chemist to the observation of chemical phenomena. One of the most interesting of these, indeed, he might well be said to be the greatest of the alchemists, is the man whose only name that we know is that which appears on a series of manuscripts written in the high German dialect of the end of the fifteenth and the beginning of the sixteenth century. That name is Basil Valentine, and the writer, according to the best historical traditions, was a Benedictine monk. The name Basil Valentine may only have been a pseudonym, for it has been impossible to trace it among the records of the monasteries of the time. That the writer was a monk there seems to be no doubt, for his writings in manuscript and printed form began to have their vogue at a time when there was little likelihood of their being attributed to a monk unless an indubitable tradition connected them with some monastery.

This Basil Valentine, to accept the only name we have, as we can judge very well from his writings, eminently deserves the designation of the last of the alchemists and the first of the chemists. There is practically a universal recognition of the fact now that he deserves in addition the title of Founder of Modern Chemistry, not only because of the value of the observations contained in his writings, but also because of the fact that they proved so suggestive to certain scientific geniuses during the century succeeding Valentine's life. Almost more than to have added to the precious heritage of knowledge for mankind is it a boon for a scientific observer to have awakened the spirit of observation in others and to be the founder of a new school of thought. This Basil Valentine undoubtedly did.

Besides his work furnishes evidence that the investigating spirit was abroad just when it is usually supposed not to have been, for the Thuringian monk surely did not do all his investigating alone, but must have received as well as given many a suggestion to his contemporaries.

In the history of education there are two commonplaces that are appealed to oftener than any other as the sources of material with regard to the influence of the Catholic Church on education during the centuries preceding the Reformation. These are the supposed

idleness of the monks and the foolish belief in the transmutation of metals and the search for the philosopher's stone which dominated the minds of so many of the educated men of the time. It is in Germany especially that these two features of the pre-Reformation period are supposed to be best illustrated, though in recent years there has come quite a revolution in the feelings even of those outside of the Church with regard to the proper appreciation of the work of the monastic scholars of these earlier centuries. Even though some of them did dream golden dreams over their alembics, the love of knowledge meant more to them as to the serious students of any age than anything that might be made on it. As for their scientific beliefs, if there can be a conversion of one element into another, as seems true of radium, then the possibility of the transmutation of metals is not so absurd, as for a century or more it has seemed, and it is not impossible that at some time even gold may be manufactured out of other metallic materials.

Of course a still worthier change of mind has come over the attitude of educators because of a growing sense of appreciation for the wonderful work of the monks of the Middle Ages, and even of those centuries that are supposed to show least of the influence of these groups of men who, forgetting material progress, devoted themselves to the preservation and the cultivation of the things of the spirit. Many exceptions doubtless there were to the general rule that sets these men far above the average of humanity of their time. But the impression that would consider the pre-Reformation monks in Germany as unworthy of their high calling in the great mass is almost entirely without foundation. Obscure though the lives of most of them were, many of them rose above their environment in such a way as to make their work landmarks in the history of progress for all time.

Because their discoveries are buried in the old Latin folios that are contained only in the best libraries not often consulted by the modern scientist, it is usually thought that the scientific investigators of these centuries before the Reformation did no work that would be worth while considering in our present day. It is only some one who goes into this matter as a labor of love who will consider it worth his while to take the trouble seriously to consult these musty old tomes. Many a scholar, however, has found his labor well rewarded by the discovery of many an anticipation of modern science in these volumes so much neglected and where such treasure troves are least expected. Professor Clifford Allbutt, the regius professor of physics at the University of Cambridge, in his address on "The Historical Relations of Medicine and Surgery Down to the End of the Sixteenth Century," which was delivered at the St.

Louis Congress of Arts and Sciences during the Exposition in 1904, has shown how much that is supposed to be distinctly modern in medicine, and above all in surgery, was the subject of discussion at the French and Italian universities of the thirteenth century. William Salicet, for instance, who taught at the University of Bologna, published a large series of case histories, substituted the knife for the Arabic use of the cautery, described the danger of wounds of the neck, investigated the causes of the failure of healing by first intention and sutured divided nerves. His pupil, Lanfranc, who taught later at the University of Paris, went farther than his master by distinguishing between venous and arterial hemorrhage, requiring digital compression for an hour to stop hemorrhage from the venae pulsatiles, the pulsating veins as they were called, and if this failed because of the size of the vessel, suggesting the application of a ligature. Lanfranc's chapter on injuries to the head still remains a noteworthy book in surgery that establishes beyond peradventure how thoughtfully practical were these teachers in the mediæval universities. It must be remembered that at this time all the teachers in universities, even those in the medical schools and even those occupied with surgery, were clerics. Professor Allbutt calls attention over and over again to this fact, because it emphasizes the thoroughness of educational methods in spite of the supposed difficulties that would lie in the way of an exclusively clerical teaching staff.

In chemistry the advances made during the thirteenth, fourteenth and fifteenth centuries were even more noteworthy than those in any other department of science. Albertus Magnus, who taught at Paris, wrote no less than sixteen treatises on chemical subjects, and in spite of the fact that he was a theologian as well as a scientist and that his printed works filled sixteen folio volumes, he somehow found the time to make many observations for himself and performed numberless experiments in order to clear up doubts. The larger histories of chemistry accord him his proper place and hail him as a great founder in chemistry and pioneer in original investigation.

Even St. Thomas Aquinas, much as he was occupied with theology and philosophy, found some time to devote to chemical questions. After all, this is only what might have been expected of the favorite pupil of Albertus Magnus. Three treatises on chemical subjects from Aquinas' pen have been preserved for us, and it is to him that we are said to owe the origin of the word amalgam, which he first used in describing various chemical methods of metallic combination that were discovered in the search for the genuine transmutation of metals.

Albertus Magnus' other great scientific pupil, Roger Bacon, the

English Franciscan friar, followed more closely in the physical scientific ways of his great master. Altogether he wrote some eighteen treatises on chemical subjects. For a long time it was considered that he was the inventor of gunpowder, though this is now known to have been introduced into Europe by the Arabs. Roger Bacon studied gunpowder and various other explosive combinations in considerable detail, and it is for this reason that he obtained the undeserved reputation of being an original discoverer in this line. How well he realized how much might be accomplished by means of the energy stored up in explosives can perhaps be best appreciated from the fact that he suggested that boats would go along the rivers and across the seas without either sails or oars and that carriages would go along the streets without horse or man power. He considered that man would eventually invent a method of harnessing these explosive mixtures and of utilizing their energies for his purposes without danger. It is curiously interesting to find as we begin the twentieth century and gasolene is so commonly used for the driving of automobiles and motor boats and is being introduced even on railroad cars in the West as the most available source of energy for suburban traffic, that this generation should only be fulfilling the idea of the old Franciscan friar of the thirteenth century who prophesied that in explosives there was the secret of eventually manageable energy for transportation purposes.

Succeeding centuries were not as fruitful in great scientists as the thirteenth, and yet at the beginning of the fourteenth there was a Pope, three of whose scientific treatises—one on the transmutation of metals, which he considers an impossibility, at least as far as the manufacture of gold and silver was concerned; a treatise on diseases of the eyes, of which Professor Allbutt[1] says that it was not without its distinctive practical value, though compiled so early in the history of eye surgery, and finally his treatise on the preservation of the health, written when he was himself over eighty years of age—are all considered by good authorities as worthy of the best scientific spirit of the time. This Pope was John XXII., of whom it has been said over and over again by Protestant historians that he issued a bull forbidding chemistry, though he was himself one of the enthusiastic students of chemistry in his younger years and always retained his interest in the science.[2]

During the fourteenth century Arnold of Villanova, the inventor of nitric acid, and the two Hollanduses kept up the tradition of

---

[1] Address cited.

[2] For the refutation of this calumny with regard to John XXII., see Pope John XXII. and the supposed Bull forbidding chemistry, by James J. Walsh, Ph. D., M. D., in the Medical Library and Historical Journal, October, 1905.

original investigation in chemistry. Altogether there are some dozen treatises from these three men on chemical subjects. The Hollanduses particularly did their work in a spirit of thoroughly frank original investigation. They were more interested in minerals than in any other class of substances, but did not waste much time on the question of transmutation of metals. Professor Thompson, the professor of chemistry at Edinburgh, said in his history of chemistry many years ago that the Hollanduses have very clear descriptions of their processes of treating minerals in order to investigate their composition, which serve to show that their knowledge was by no means entirely theoretical or acquired only from books or by argumentation.

Before the end of this fourteenth century, according to the best authorities on this subject, Basil Valentine, the more particular subject of our essay, was born.

Valentine's career is a typical example of the personally obscure but intellectually brilliant lives which these old monks live. It seems probable, according to the best authorities, as we have said, that his work began shortly before the middle of the fifteenth century, though most of what was important in it was accomplished during the second half. It would not be so surprising as most people who have been brought up to consider the period just before the Reformation in Germany as wanting in progressive scholars might imagine for a supremely great original investigator to have existed in North Germany about this time. After all, before the end of the century, Copernicus, working in Northern Germany, had announced his theory that the earth was not the centre of the universe, and had set forth all that this announcement meant. To a Bishop friend who said to him, "But this means that you are giving up a new universe," he replied that the universe was already there, but his theory would lead men to recognize its existence. In Southern Germany Thomas à Kempis, who died in 1471, had traced for man the outlines of another universe, that of his own soul, from its mystically practical side. These great Germans were only the worthy contemporaries of many other German scholars only less distinguished than these supreme geniuses. The second half of the fifteenth century, the beginning of the Renaissance in Germany as well as Italy, is that wonderful time in history when somehow men's eyes were opened to see farther and their minds broadened to gather in more of the truth of man's relation to the universe than had ever before been the case in all the centuries of human existence, or than has ever been possible even in these more modern centuries, though supposedly we are the heirs of all the ages in the foremost files of time. Coming as he did before printing, when tradition was even more

dominating than now, it is almost needless to say that there are many curious traditions associated with the name of Basil Valentine. Two centuries before his time Roger Bacon, doing his work in England, had succeeded in attracting so much attention even from the common people, because of his wonderful scientific discoveries, that his name became a by-word in popular parlance and many strange magical feats were attributed to him. Friar Bacon was the great wizard even in the plays of the Elizabethan period. Something of the same sort of tradition sprang up with regard to the Benedictine monk of the fifteenth century. Even his manuscript, it was said, had not been published directly, but had been hidden in a pillar in the church attached to the monastery and had been discovered there after the splitting open of the pillar by a bolt of lightning from heaven. It is the extension of this tradition that has sometimes led to the assumption that Valentine lived in an earlier century, some even going so far as to say that he, too, like Roger Bacon, was a product of the thirteenth century. It seems reasonably possible, however, to separate the traditional from what is actual in his existence, and thus to obtain some idea at least of his work, if not of the details of his life. The internal evidence from his works enable the historian of science to place him within a half century of the discovery of America.

One of the stories told with regard to Basil Valentine, because it has become a commonplace in philology, has made him more generally known than any of his actual discoveries. In one of the most popular of the old-fashioned text-books of chemistry in use a quarter of a century ago in the chapter on Antimony there was a story that I suppose students never forgot. It was said that Basil Valentine, a monk of the Middle Ages, was the discoverer of this substance. After having experimented with it in a number of ways, he threw some of it out of his laboratory one day, where the swine of the monastery, finding it, proceeded to gobble it up in connection with some other refuse. He watched the effect upon the swine very carefully, and found that after a preliminary period of digestive disturbance these swine developed an enormous appetite and became fatter than any of the others. This seemed a rather desirable result, and Basil Valentine, ever on the search for the practical, thought that he might use the remedy to good purpose even on the members of the community.

Some of the monks in the monastery were rather of frail health and delicate constitution, and he thought that the putting on of a little fat in their case might be a good thing. Accordingly he administered some of the salts of antimony with which he was experimenting surreptitiously in the food served to these monks. The result,

however, was not so favorable as in the case of the hogs. Indeed, according to one, though less authentic, version of the story, some of the poor monks, the unconscious subjects of the experiment, even perished as the result of the ingestion of the antimonial compounds. According to the better version they suffered only the usual unpleasant consequences of taking antimony which are quite enough for a fitting climax to the story. Basil Valentine called the new substance which he had discovered antimony, that is, opposed to monks. It might be good for hogs, but it was a form of monks' bane as it were.[3]

Unfortunately for most of the good stories of history modern criticism has nearly always failed to find any authentic basis for them and they have had to go the way of the legends of Washington's hatchet and Tell's hat. We are sorry to say that that seems to be true also for this special story. Antimony, the word, is very probably derived from certain dialectic forms of the Greek word, for the metal and the name is no more derived from anti and monachus than it is from anti and monos (opposed to single existence), another fictitious derivation that has been suggested, and whose etymological value is supposed to consist in the fact that antimony is practically never found alone in nature.

Notwithstanding the apparent cloud of unfounded traditions that are associated with his name, there can be no doubt at all of the fact that Valentinus, to give him the Latin name by which he is commonly designated in foreign literatures, was one of the great geniuses who, working in obscurity, make precious steps into the unknown that enable humanity after them to see things more clearly than ever before. There are definite historical grounds for placing Basil Valentine as the first of the series of careful observers who differentiated chemistry from the old alchemy and applied its precious treasures of information to the uses of medicine. It was because of the study of Basil Valentine's work that Paracelsus broke away from the Galenic traditions so supreme in medicine up to his time and began our modern pharmaceutics. Following on the heels of Paracelsus came Van Helmont, the father of modern medical chemistry, and these three did more than any others to enlarge the scope

[3] It is curious to trace how old are the traditions on which some of these old stories that must now be rejected are founded. I have come upon the story with regard to Basil Valentine and the antimony and the monks in an old French medical encyclopedia of biography, published in the seventeenth century, and at that time there was no doubt at all expressed as to its truth. How much older than this it may be I do not know, though it is probable that it comes from the sixteenth century, when the *kakoethes scribendi* attacked many people because of the facility of printing, and when most of the good stories that have so worried the modern dry-as-dust historian in his researches for their correction became a part of the body of supposed historical tradition.

of medication and to make observation rather than authority the most important criterion of truth in medicine. Indeed, the work of these three men dominated medicine, or at least the department of pharmaceutics, down almost to our own day, and their influence is still felt in drug giving.

While we do not know the absolute date of either the birth or the death of Basil Valentine and are not sure even of the exact period in which he lived and did his work, we are sure that a great original observer about the time of the invention of printing studied mercury and sulphur and various salts, and above all introduced antimony to the notice of the scientific world, and especially to the favor of practitioners of medicine. His book, "The Triumphal Chariot of Antimony," is full of conclusions not quite justified by his premises nor by his observations. There is no doubt, however, that the observational methods which he employed did give an immense amount of knowledge and formed the basis of the method of investigation by which the chemical side of medicine was to develop during the next two or three centuries. Great harm was done by the abuse of antimony, but then great harm is done by the abuse of anything, no matter how good it may be. For a time it came to be the most important drug in medicine and was only replaced by venesection. The fact of the matter is that doctors were looking for effects from their drugs, and antimony is above all things effective. Patients, too, wished to see the effect of the medicines they took. They do so even yet, and when antimony was administered there was no doubt about that.

Some five years ago when Sir Michael Foster, M. D., professor of physiology in the University of Cambridge, England, was invited to deliver the Lane lectures at the Cooper Medical College, in San Francisco, he took for his subject "The History of Physiology." In the course of his lecture on "The Rise of Chemical Physiology" he began with the name of Basil Valentine, who first attracted men's attention to the many chemical substances around them that might be used in the treatment of disease, and said of him:

"He was one of the alchemists, but in addition to his inquiries into the properties of metals and his search for the philosopher's stone, he busied himself with the nature of drugs, vegetable and mineral, and with their action as remedies for disease. He was no anatomist, no physiologist, but rather what nowadays we should call a pharmacologist. He did not care for the problems of the body, all he sought to understand was how the constituents of the soil and of plants might be treated so as to be available for healing the sick and how they produced their effects. We apparently owe to him the introduction of many chemical substances, for instance, of hydro-

chloric acid, which he prepared from oil of vitriol and salt, and of many vegetable drugs. And he was apparently the author of certain conceptions which, as we shall see, played an important part in the development of chemistry and of physiology. To him, it seems, we owe the idea of the three 'elements' as they were and have been called, replacing the old idea of the ancients of the four elements—earth, air, fire and water. It must be remembered, however, that both in the ancient and in the new idea the word 'element' was not intended to mean that which it means to us now, a fundamental unit of matter, but a general quality or property of matter. The three elements of Valentine were (1) sulphur, or that which is combustible, which is changed or destroyed, or which at all events disappears during burning or combustion; (2) mercury, that which temporarily disappears during burning or combustion, which is dissociated in the burning from the body burnt, but which may be recovered, that is to say, that which is volatile, and (3) salt, that which is fixed, the residue or ash which remains after burning."

The most interesting of Basil Valentine's books, and the one which has had the most enduring influence, is undoubtedly "The Triumphal Chariot of Antimony." It has been translated and has had a wide vogue in every language of modern Europe. Its recommendation of antimony had such an effect upon medical practice that it continued to be the most important drug in the pharmacopœia down almost to the middle of the nineteenth century. If any proof were needed that Basil Valentine or that the author of the books that go under that name was a monk, it would be found in the introduction to this volume, which not only states that fact very clearly, but also in doing so makes use of language that shows the writer to have been deeply imbued with the old monastic spirit. I quote the first paragraph of this introduction in order to make clear what I mean. The quotation is taken from the English translation of the work, as published in London in 1678. Curiously enough, seeing the obscurity surrounding Valentine himself, we do not know for sure who made the translation. The translator apologizes somewhat for the deeply religious spirit of the book, but considers that he was not justified in eliminating any of this. Of course, the translation is left in the quaint old-fashioned form so eminently suited to the thoughts of the old master, and the spelling and use of capitals is not changed:

"Basil Valentine: His Triumphant Chariot of Antimony.—Since I, Basil Valentine, by Religious Vows am bound to live according to the Order of St. Benedict, and that requires another manner of spirit of Holiness than the common state of Mortals exercised in the profane business of this World; I thought it my

duty before all things, in the beginning of this little book, to declare what is necessary to be known by the pious Spagyrist (old-time name for medical chemist), inflamed with an ardent desire of this Art, as what he ought to do, and whereunto to direct his aim, that he may lay such foundations of the whole matter as may be stable; lest his Building, shaken with the Winds, happen to fall, and the whole Edifice to be involved in shameful Ruine, which otherwise, being founded on more firm and solid principles, might have continued for a long series of time. Which Admonition I judged was, is and always will be a necessary part of my Religious Office; especially since we must all die, and no one of us which are now, whether high or low, shall long be seen among the number of men. For it concerns me to recommend these Meditations of Mortality to Posterity, leaving them behind me, not only that honor may be given to the Divine Majesty, but also that Men may obey him sincerely in all things.

"In this my Meditation I found that there were five principal heads, chiefly to be considered by the wise and prudent spectators of our Wisdom and Art. The first of which is, Invocation of God. The second, Contemplation of Nature. The third, True Preparation. The fourth, the Way of Using. The fifth, Utility and Fruit. For he who regards not these, shall never obtain place among true Chymists, or fill up the number of perfect Spagyrists. Therefore, touching these five heads, we shall here following treat and so far declare them, as that the general Work may be brought to light and perfected by an intent and studious Operator."

This book, though the title might seem to indicate it, is not devoted entirely to the study of antimony, but contains many important additions to the chemistry of the time. For instance, Basil Valentine explains in this work how what he calls the spirit of salt might be obtained. He succeeded in manufacturing this material by treating common salt with oil of vitriol and heat. From the description of the uses to which he put the end product of his chemical manipulation it is evident that under the name of spirit of salt he is describing what we now know as hydrochloric acid. This is the first definite mention of it in the history of science, and the method suggested for its preparation is not very different from that employed even at the present time. He also suggests in this volume how alcohol may be obtained in high strengths. He distilled the spirit obtained from wine over carbonate of potassium, and thus succeeded in depriving it of a great proportion of its water.

We have said that he was deeply interested in the philosopher's stone. Naturally this turned his attention to the study of metals, and so it is not surprising to find that he succeeded in formulating

a method by which metallic copper could be obtained. The substance used for the purpose was copper pyrites, which was changed to an impure sulphate of copper by the action of oil of vitriol and moist air. The sulphate of copper occurred in solution, and the copper could be precipitated from it by plunging an iron bar into it. Basil Valentine recognized the presence of this peculiar yellow metal and studied some of its qualities. He does not seem to have been quite sure, however, whether the phenomenon that he witnessed was not really a transmutation of the iron into copper as a consequence of the other chemicals present.

There are some observations on chemical physiology, and especially with regard to respiration, in the book on antimony that show their author to have anticipated the true explanation of the theory of respiration. He states that animals breathe because the air is needed to support their life, and that all the animals exhibit the phenomenon of respiration. He even insists that the fishes, though living in water, breathe air and adduces in support of this idea the fact that whenever a river is entirely frozen the fishes die. The reason for this being, according to this old-time physiologist, not that the fishes are frozen to death, but that they are not able to obtain air in the ice as they did in the water, and consequent perish.

There are many testimonies to the practical character of all his knowledge and his desire to apply it for the benefit of humanity. The old monk could not repress the expression of his impatience with physicians who gave to patients for diseases of which they knew little remedies of which they knew less. For him it was an unpardonable sin for a physician not to have faithfully studied the various mixtures that he prescribed for his patients, and not to know not only their appearance and taste and effect, but all the limits of their application. Considering that at the present time it is a frequent source of complaint that physicians often prescribe remedies with whose physical appearances they are not familiar, this complaint of the old-time chemist alchemist will be all the more interesting for the modern physician. It is evident that when Basil Valentine allows his ire to get the better of him it is because of his indignation over the quacks who were abusing medicine and patients in his time, as they have ever since. There is a curious bit of aspersion of mere book learning in the passage that has a distinctly modern ring, and one feels the truth of Russell Lowell's expression that to read a great genius, no matter how antique, is always to seem to be reading a commentary in the morning paper, so up-to-date does genius ever remain:

"And whensoever I shall have occasion to contend in the School with such a Doctor, who knows not how himself to prepare his own

medicines, but commits that business to another, I am sure I shall obtain the Palm from him; for indeed that good man knows not what medicines he prescribes to the sick; whether the color of them be white, black, grey or blew, he cannot tell; nor doth this wretched man know whether the medicine he gives be dry or hot, cold or humid; but he only knows that he found it so written in his Books, and thence pretends knowledge (or as it were, Possession) by Prescription of a very long time; yet he desires to further Information. Here again let it be lawful to exclaim, Good God, to what a state is the matter brought! what goodness of minde is in these men! what care do they take of the sick! Wo, wo to them! in the day of Judgment they will find the fruit of their ignorance and rashness, then they will see him whom they pierced, when they neglected their Neighbor, sought after money and nothing else; whereas were they cordial in their profession, they would spend Nights and Days in Labour that they might become more learned in their Art, whence more certain health would accrew to the sick with their Estimation and greater glory to themselves. But since Labour is tedious to them, they commit the matter to chance, and being secure of their Honour, and content with their Fame, they (like Brawlers) defend themselves with a certain garrulity, without any respect had to Confidence or Truth."

Perhaps one of the reasons why Valentine's book has been of such enduring interest is that it is written in an eminently human vein and out of a lively imagination. It is full of figures relating to many other things besides chemistry, which serve to show how deeply this investigating observer was attentive to all the problems of life around him. For instance, when he wants to describe the affinity that exists between many substances in chemistry, and which makes it impossible for them not to be attracted to one another, he takes a figure from the attractions that he sees exist among men and women. There are some paragraphs with regard to the influence of the passion of love that one might think rather a quotation from an old-time sermon than from a great ground-breaking book in the science of chemistry.

"Love leaves nothing entire or sound in man; it impedes his sleep, he cannot rest either day or night; it takes off his appetite that he hath no disposition either to meat or drink by reason of the continual torments of his heart and mind. It deprives him of all Providence, hence he neglects his affairs, vocation and business. He minds neither study, labor nor prayer; casts away all thoughts of anything but the body beloved; this is his study, this his most vain occupation. If to lovers the success be not answerable to their wish, or so soon and prosperously as they desire, how many melancholies henceforth arise, with griefs and sadnesses, with which they

pine away and wax so lean as they have scarcely any flesh cleaving to the bones. Yea, at last they lose the life itself, as may be proved by many examples! for such men, (which is an horrible thing to think of) slight and neglect all perils and detriments, both of the body and life, and of the soul and eternal salvation."

It is evident that human nature is not different in our sophisticated twentieth century from that which this observant old monk saw around him in the fifteenth. He continues:

"How many testimonies of this violence which is in love, are daily found? for it not only inflames the younger sort, but it so far exaggerates some persons far gone in years as through the burning heat thereof, they are almost mad. Natural diseases are for the most part governed by the complexion of man and therefore invade some more fircely, others more gently; but Love, without distinction of poor or rich, young or old, siezeth all, and having seized so blinds them as forgetting all rules of reason, they neither see nor hear any snare."

But then the old monk thinks that he has said enough with regard to this subject and apologized for his digression in another paragraph that should remove any lingering doubt there may be with regard to the genuineness of his monastic character. The personal element in his confession is so naïve and so simply straightforward that instead of seeming to be the result of conceit, and so repelling the reader it rather attracts his kindly feeling for its author. The paragraph would remind one in certain ways of that personal element that was to become more popular in literature after Montaigne had made such extensive use of it.

"But of these enough; for it becomes not a religious man to insist too long upon these cogitations, or to give place to such a flame in his heart. Hitherto (without boasting I speak it) I have throughout the whole course of my life kept myself safe and free from it, and I pray and invoke God to vouchsafe me his Grace that I may keep holy and inviolate the faith which I have sworn, and live contented with my spiritual spouse, the Holy Catholick Church. For no other reason have I alleaged these than that I might express the love with which all tinctures ought to be moved towards metals, if ever they be admitted by them into true friendship, and by love, which permeates the inmost parts, be converted into a better state."

The application of the figure at the end of his long digression is characteristic of the period in which he wrote and to a considerable extent also of the German literary methods of the time.

In this volume on the use of antimony there are in most of the editions certain biographical notes which have sometimes been accepted as authentic, but oftener rejected. According to these,

Basil Valentine was born in a town in Alsace, on the southern bank of the Rhine. As a consequence of this, there are several towns that have laid claim to being his birthplace. M. Jean Reynaud, the distinguished French philosophic writer of the first half of the nineteenth century, once said that Basil Valentine, like Ossian and Homer, had many towns claim him years after his death. He also suggested that like those old poets, it was possible that the writings sometimes attributed to Basil Valentine were really the work not of one man, but of several individuals. There are, however, many objections to this theory, the most forceful of which is the internal evidence of the books themselves and their style and method of treatment. Other biographic details contained in "The Triumphal Chariot of Antimony" are undoubtedly more correct. According to them, Basil Valentine traveled in England and Holland on missions for his order, and went through France and Spain on a pilgrimage to St. James of Compostella.

Besides his work "The Triumphal Chariot of Antimony" there are a number of other books of Basil Valentine's, printed during the first half of the sixteenth century, that are well known and copies of which may be found in most of the important libraries. The United States Surgeon General's Library at Washington contains several of the works on medical subjects, and the New York Academy of Medicine Library has some valuable editions of his works. Some of his other well-known books, each one of which is a good-sized octavo volume, bear the following descriptive titles (I give them in English, though as they are usually to be found they are in Latin, sixteenth century translations of the original German): "The World in Miniature; or, The Mystery of the World and of Human Medical Science," published at Marburg, 1609; "The Chemical Apocalypse; or, The Manifestation of Artificial Chemical Compounds," published at Erfurt in 1624; "A Chemico Philosophic Treatise Concerning Things Natural and Preternatural, Especially Relating to the Metals and the Minerals," published at Frankfurt in 1676; "Haliography; or, The Science of Salts: A Treatise on the Preparation, Use and Chemical Properties of All the Mineral, Animal and Vegetable Salts," published at Bologna in 1644; "The Twelve Keys of Philosophy," Leipsic, 1630.

The great interest manifested in Basil Valentine's work at the Renaissance period can be best realized from the number of manuscripts and the wide distribution. His books were not all printed at one place, but, on the contrary, in different portions of Europe. The original edition of "The Triupmhal Chariot of Antimony" was published at Leipsic in the early part of the sixteenth century. The first editions of the other books, however, appeared at places so

distant from Leipsic as Amsterdam and Bologna, while various cities of Germany, as Erfurt and Frankfort, claim the original editions of still other works. Many of the manuscript copies still exist in various libraries in Europe, and while there is no doubt that some unimportant additions to the supposed works of Basil Valentine have come from the attribution to him of scientific treatises of other German writers, the style and the method of the principal works mentioned is entirely too similar not to have been the fruit of a single mind and that possessed of a distinct investigating genius that sets it far above any of its contemporaries in scientific speculation and observation.

The most interesting feature of all of Basil Valentine's writings that are extant is the distinctive tendency to make his observations of special practical utility. His studies in antimony were made mainly with the idea of showing how that substance might be used in medicine. He did not neglect to point out other possible uses, however, and knew the secret of the employment of antimony in order to give sharpness and definition to the impression produced by metal types. It would seem as though he was the first scientist who discussed this subject, and there is even some question whether printers and type founders did not derive their ideas in this matter from Basil Valentine, rather than he from them. Interested as he was in the transmutation of metals, he never failed to try to find and suggest some medical use for all of the substances that he investigated. His was no greedy search for gold and no accumulation of investigations with the idea of benefiting only himself. Mankind was always in his mind, and perhaps there is no better demonstration of his fulfillment of the character of the monk than this constant solicitude to benefit others by every bit of investigation that he carried out. For him with mediæval nobleness of spirit the first part of every work must be the invocation of God, and the last, though no less important than the first, must be the utility and fruit for mankind that can be derived from it.

James J. Walsh.

New York.

## THE ANGELIC DOCTOR ON "THE ANGELS."

THE history of the human race, like the histories of the individuals that go to make it up, is crystallized round the development of human thought. The desires and the achievements, the projects and the attempts, no matter in what sphere of action, the manners and the civilization, the family and the social standards are only properly understood when they are considered in relation to the psychological atmosphere of which they are the natural and perhaps the necessary outcome. They find an explanation and are coherent only in proportion as they are systematically grouped around that striving—blind it may be or unconscious—towards a spiritual ideal that expresses itself, partially, fragmentarily, spasmodically, perhaps, but always characteristically, in the outward tokens of life.

We have the advantage of possessing the intimate history of the evolutions of individual thought in such writings as the Confessions of St. Augustine, the Apologia of Cardinal Newman or the Journal of Maine de Biran, autobiographic evolutions that fill the gulf between the youthful Manichæan and the Saint of Hippo, between the vivid imagination and morbid Calvinism of the boy and the calm confidence of the saintly prelate, between the ideology and materialism of the politician and the fullness of stature of the Christian faith.

More intimate still, if less clearly and definitely formulated, is the history of the personal development of each one of us as our natures unfold amid the innumerable circumstances that play their part in this characteristic evolution. It is difficult to realize the progress that we may have made; difficult to call a halt at any one definite point of our intellectual growth—save, possibly, at those great and profound crises, spiritual or mental, through which some of us have passed, and even then it is not easy—to sum up and set down in black and white the precise personal factors that combined to make us what we then were; difficult to gather up all the various threads that we have woven into the fabric of our personality and say for a certainty how as reasoning beings we now stand. But it is far more difficult than this to lay our finger upon the pulse of the thought-evolution of the race itself and gather from its throbbing the true meaning and import of the events, the crises and the commonplaces of external history. For to unlock the least problem is to hold in our hands the master key of the whole period.

There are bright lights and there are dark shadows alternating in the course of most, if not of all, human lives. Each one of us

has only to look back through a few checkered years to attest the fact. There are bright and dark pages in the history of the world; pages that bear the records of noble deeds and high aspirations side by side with those sodden with tears and blood, through whose dark stains we read other records of cruelty and oppression, of broken hopes and hopeless hearts, of that "nature red in tooth and claw," by a ghastly perversion of its appointed order, in an inhuman brute obsession, taking hold of human hearts and setting man at the throat of his fellow-man. So there are bright and dark intervals marking the line of thought-progress throughout the ages. It is as though the race, driven forward by the desire for natural truth, had pursued an unequal way—through plain and over mountain, here shrouded in the mists of the valley, there deviating from the straight path, and again coming back and catching the gleams of the sunlight as it stands upon the eminences that crown the road marking the way of its destiny.

To understand aright the events of history the motive power of thought must be understood, and thought upon the heights rather than in the valleys. For if the mountain peaks marking the true path of intellectual destiny be surveyed aright, the deviations, the misty valleys and the long detours can be gauged and valued at something approaching a true estimate. And of these mountain peaks—these heights of intellectual greatness in the thought-history of the human race—perhaps none is so interesting or so illuminating as that which was attained in the thirteenth century of the Christian era. This was the period that produced the greatest teachers and the most subtle thinkers, the century that saw the rise and development of the universities.

The period of growth, distinguished by the isolated individualism of the school establishments, gave place to the greater syntheses of the master minds; and as fresh bands of students flocked to the reconstituted centres of learning they found that two centuries and a half of tentative scholasticism had prepared the ground for Alexander of Hales, for St. Bonaventure, for Albert the Great, for Duns Scotus and for St. Thomas Aquinas.

Individualistic still in the dominating personality of these great men and in no small degree also in the peculiarities of their teaching, the golden age of the schools was distinguished from both the preceding and the subsequent period by the similarity of aim and of method running through it, by the newly introduced organon of Aristotelian philosophy and by the one underlying conviction that both divinely revealed and humanly discovered knowledge could be welded together into one complete system of thought.

And so from the rich storehouses of the past, from the Platonism

of Plato and the Neo-Platonism of Plotinus, from the writings of the fathers—and not least from the mystical speculations of Dionysius—and from the Sacred Scriptures, borrowing from whatever philosophical tradition had left of the good and the true, the leaders of thought in the thirteenth century created a new eclectic philosophy dominated by the Christianized spirit of the Stagyrite. This philosophy flourished in the new soil. It was essentially an assertion of the rights of human reason; yet, had it not been closely connected with divine faith, it would not have flourished at all. Its professors and its exponents, those who had made the syntheses that brought it into being, were above all things Christian men. They found their home in houses sheltering the spiritual children of St. Francis or of St. Dominic. Alexander was a Franciscan and the first teacher of the order in the University of Paris. St. Bonaventure, his pupil at Paris, and Duns Scotus, who studied at Oxford, where, as at Paris and afterwards at Cologne, he also taught, were both members of the same order. Albert the Great and St. Thomas were both of the company of the friars preachers. It was in the silence of the cloister, meditating of divine things and practising the mortified life of religious that the characters of these men were formed. With the exception of Albert, and possibly of Alexander, they had come young to the school of self-discipline and poverty, and were formed to the rule of their institute before their philosophical studies began. And the consequences of this preliminary disciplining and training of the character is manifest in their maturer synthesis of knowledge. They were practical Christians first, philosophers and theologians afterwards. With them the demands of a recognition of the rights of human reason issued, not in a slavish subjection of revelation to dialectical criticism nor in an usurpation by intellect of the sphere of divine truth, but in a temper of mind and an instrument of reasoning best calculated to defend the faith. Nor did the Christian spirit with which they were so thoroughly imbued hinder or frustrate in the slightest degree the full development of natural knowledge. On the contrary, it promoted it. The scholastic thesis that God was the author of all truth made a synthesis logically possible. There could be no possible contradictions in the contents of true knowledge, coming by no matter how divergent and disparate channels, since they all had their origin in a uniquely common source. And indeed in no few cases the incentive to further purely rational investigation was given by the dogmas of the faith where rational methods alone would have failed to raise the question.

The scholastics were accused by their contemporaries of rationalism. They have been accused by another generation of fideism. To the mystic they appear to exalt reason at the expense of a trust-

ing faith. To certain types of undisciplined mind they yoke the intelligence at all hazards to a subservient defense of orthodoxy. As a matter of fact, their best claim to greatness lies in the position they so unflinchingly took up. Reason and revelation are not and cannot be opposed. They can be made to fit together into one sublimer scheme. Philosophy is the *ancilla theologiae,* not the *serva*—for philosophy is freeborn as well as theology, and she acknowledges the same parentage.

When the greater scholastics had quitted the world of dialectic for that brighter world they always kept before their eyes, they left little, save in the possible sphere of scientific observation and actual investigation, to be done. Friar Bacon had pointed out the road that later on was to lead to reform in science and to exact scientific results. But few trod it. The once great schools, glorying in the breadth of mind and pentrative power of their masters, launched out in commentaries and in purely dialectical questions. The originality was lost, the synthetic spirit quenched. The Averroists sank, like the later Pythagoreans, to the level of invoking authority as their strongest argument. Ipsedixitism reigned supreme. The Scotists and the Thomists occupied their time in vain speculations and in fostering the differences that divided their rival schools. The fine old disputations gave place to wordy battles. The universals, and the plurality of forms, and the distinctions of essences and existences were lost in a maze of verbiage, rhetoric and inept definition. "*Quare facit opium dormire? quia in eo est virtus dormitiva,*" wrote Moliére in ridicule of a similar pompous verboseness, and Erasmus could not resist the caustic taunt that he flung at the decadent philosophers of the later schools: "There are innumerable quibblings also much more subtle (than these), concerning instances and notions, and relations and formalitations, and quiddities and ecceities, which no one can follow out with eyes, except a lynx, which is said to be able in the thickest darkness to see things which exist nowhere." Scathing words, and those of the humanist ready to hold up to the ridicule of the newer learning the weakest point in a stagnating period of thought.

But the humanists did not altogether mend matters. They did not turn the organon of scientific investigation suggested by Albert the Great and Friar Bacon upon the vast field of nature lying before their eyes. That work was reserved for the scientific school of the sixteenth century. On the contrary, the classical spirit of the Renaissance, while it may certainly be credited with the revival of learning and letters, did little to advance the progress of knowledge. The humanists railed at the scholastics and at scholasticism, and their keen wit found out the vulnerable parts in a scholasticism that

was already moribund. But when they leveled their weapons of satire and ridicule at the solid work of the masters of the thirteenth century they went too far and showed a colossal ignorance of the scope and meaning alike of the endeavors of the schoolmen.

If they were able to find repetition, and comment, and logomachy, and subtle quibbling in the later representatives of the great mediæval doctors, they might also have taken the trouble to search beneath it for an attempt, at least, to perpetuate the ancient teaching. The fact that their criticism is surface work and that they never succeeded in grasping the principles that infused life into the dry bones of dialectic stamp their criticism as worthless and, as far at any rate as the makers of the system are concerned, as gratuitous and impertinent.

And what is the pith of the charge brought against scholasticism by the humanists of the Renaissance and, it may well be added, by the representatives of the so-called scientific spirit? The accusation of the mystics was that of rationalism. That it was unjust is as obvious in the light of immediately subsequent events as by reason of the service that the schools did to the faith. You may outshout the instinctive cry of reason, but you cannot stifle it; and if the truth of revelation can be lost in the clamor, then it is better that it should be lost. There is no contradiction, said the scholastics, between reason and faith. And they proved it to the hilt.

The accusation of the humanists was that the scholastics were too slavishly subservient to the divine truth of revelation, and this to the injury of human or natural truths, and that of the scientists was tantamount to the same reproach. But here again the principle of the scholastics, radically opposed to that of the Averroists—that what is true in human knowledge holds good also in regard to revelation, and what is true in theology cannot be false in philosophy—gives the keynote in accord with which the accusation must be judged. It stands or falls with the truth of that most radical of scholastic principles.

Have the humanists possession of a body of truth, absolutely and irrevocably certain, that is in conflict with the truths of revelation? Do the scientists find, with an invincible human necessity, that the candid interrogation of nature contradicts the faith? Then indeed the claim of revelation is an absurdity and faith is a rational impossibility.

But is it so? Is such a supposition possible? Can it be that faith is to be reconstructed upon a basis, personal, emotional, necessitarian, required by our human nature in its entirety, yet contradicted by that sovereign reason that makes our human nature what it is? If such is the case, if reason is untrustworthy in matters of sentiment and

principle, then indeed are the schoolmen wrong; but then also is the passing knell of science tolled and the yawning grave opened in which humanism will be interred. But if, on the other hand, the contrary is true, then scholasticism stands vindicated and unassailable.

We may well afford to pass over the deserved criticism of a scholasticism that is not scholasticism, so long as the true system is left untouched.

Still, for the cavil does not stop at a degenerate phase, even St. Thomas is guilty of hair-splitting and superfluous, niggling, trivial writing. Witness the "Quæstiones Disputatae," the "Quodlibeta," or, to strike at once at the works upon which his greatness and title to fame are principally based, the articles in the "Summa Theologica" and the "Contra Gentiles" that deal with the angels.

We may at once assign a reason for the treatment by St. Thomas of the questions set out in the "Quodlibeta." They were composed as off-hand answers to questions sent up to him by his pupils or others interested in and possibly keenly exercised over the subjects which are treated. In much the same way might a zealous and patient controversialist of to-day reply to letters or queries in themselves absolutely pointless or absurd received from those who felt the need of guidance and consolation from a reputable theologian.

Touching the "Quæstiones Disputatae," they were as it were asides in the curriculum of the university—questions arising out of the difficulties in the text studied or not bearing directly upon the synthetic scheme which St. Thomas ever bore in mind when composing the "Summa Theologica" or the "Contra Gentiles."

But as to the length to which the articles upon the angels in these two last mentioned works are drawn out, there is another and a more direct answer to be given.

The principal information that we possess as to the existence of the angels arises from revelation. It is true that St. Thomas, faithful to the spirit of the age, brings forward purely natural arguments to demonstrate the existence of such separated intelligences. Two, at least, of these reasons may be considered sufficient upon *a priori* grounds to provide a reasonable, as distinct from a revelational reason for holding their existence. But in the "Summa Theologica" alone there are one hundred and seventeen articles—seventy-two and forty-five consecutively—devoted definitely to the angels, and in the "Contra Gentiles" there is a proportionate and surprising number of chapters consecrated to the same considerations.

Surely it might be urged the subject is one too obscure, one upon which there are far too few data to be found, even in revelation, to

merit so prolonged a treatment at the hands of a grave theologian. Is it not a subject preëminently scholastic, one which provides ample scope for the wildest flights of the imagination, prolific of subtle questions, fruitful in contrary reasons and resting upon the slender support of *a priori* assumptions? Does not the angel of the schools set the lead in these articles and in that tantalizing unfinished treatise, "De Substantiis Separatis," for later and, if possible, even less profitable speculations? Does he not open the door to the gravest abuse of a system that already has the vice of an inherent tendency towards vain speculations and verbal cavils?

The main endeavor of the schoolmen must not be lost sight of in any attempt to find answers to such questions. If external history is to be read in the light of the history of thought, the externalized thought itself no less needs to be interpreted in the light of the method, and above all of the end that the thinkers had in view. That, as we have already seen, was preëminently the synthesis of natural and revealed truth. From revelation they borrowed, and from the almost evolutionistic natural view of the universe that the great schoolmen took—though they avoided the crude philosophical contradictions of a materialistic evolution in their doctrine of substantial forms—they inferred the existence of created intellectual beings higher than man (since they are not even united to matter) completing the scale of creation upwards from the mere inert forms of elemental bodies, through the vegetable and animal kingdoms, past the soul of man himself and on up to the cherubim and seraphim standing about the very throne of God. It was a noble conception of creation justified certainly by the one source of truth and, where it did not appeal to history for a record of angelic visitations and apparitions, putting forward "reasons" in the line of pure thought to justify its claim to be a conclusion of the other. It is a conception worthy of philosophy and of theology alike, and more than favorably comparable with most of the conceptions of the universe of things, based on far less solid considerations, that are put forward in these days.

Nor is there to be discovered in St. Thomas' treatment of the subject the scholastic quibbling, the hair-splitting subtlety or the juggling verbalism that some of our guides to knowledge, ancient or modern, would have us expect. He faces the questions as they arise frankly and squarely. He has regard to the pros and cons. He records dispassionately—and, curiously enough, the lack of passion is a distinguishing mark in the writings of the great scholastics in forcible contrast with those of most of their opponents—opinions contrary to the doctrine he defends; and he not seldom acknowledges the limitations under which he works in a happy ex-

pression indicating a natural probability and throwing the chief onus of the conclusion upon theological rather than purely philosophical considerations.

Writing and teaching in an age when the elements of what has now grown into the sciences were crude and jejune in the extreme, he not infrequently astonishes his modern readers by his penetrating foresight. Thus in another place[1] his extraordinarily interesting anticipation of quite recent biological theories with regard to the succession of forms, or evolutionary stages, in the embryo, though reached by quite another process than that of embryologists, is in itself sufficient to indicate his own genius as well as to bring out one of the strong points of his philosophical system.

When raising the question as to whether there are many angels,[2] he refers to the teaching of Plato, Aristotle and the Rabbi Moses. He gives their opinions simply and unaffectedly, showing his reverence for the Stagyrite by the careful way in which he introduces the reasons justifying his unwillingness to follow Plato. He gives the Jew Maimonides the full credit of his attempt to concord the doctrine of the philosopher with holy writ. He quotes Denis the Areopagite in support of his own conclusion, and at once proceeds to justify it. And lastly, despite his Aristotelian bias and temper of mind, he has no hesitation in discounting the argument of "the philosopher" and putting himself in advance of the popular belief and the somewhat crude notions of contemporary astronomy, when he subjoins, in answer to the third *videtur:* "The argument is Aristotle's. And it would conclude necessarily *if* separated substances did exist on account of corporeal ones."

The article is one typical of his style and spirit. But it is not only because he contrasts and balances one against the other the teaching of other philosophers and thinkers that his work, even upon the angels, is useful. The thought-spirit of the age, and certainly not the thought-spirit of this its foremost representative, was not one of mere comment, piecing together and writing text-books. It was creative, very profound, very methodical and extraordinarily representative. If any one took the trouble to look up the references given in the index of the "Summa Theologica" to "angels"—there are altogether three hundred and fifty-eight topics, many of them referring to four or five, some to eight and nine, different places in the work—he would discover how carefully the doctrines contained in St. Thomas' writings had been discussed and thought out, not only as separate and distinct subjects, but in relation to all the other parts of philosophy and theology with which they come in contact.

1 "Summa Theologica," 1a, Q. 118, a. 2, ad 2um.
2 *Ibid*, 1a, Q. 4, a. 3.

It would be surprising if such a systematic treatment did not issue in a concordant, definite and satisfying doctrine.[3]

Indeed, so wonderful is this interrelationship of topics and so necessary a grasp of each question in all its bearings as worked out by the scholastic masters, that it is practically impossible to understand aright the full force of a doctrine taught by them until it has been followed out in all its ramifications under their guidance. Anything less than that would savor of superficial acquaintance, and we can well understand how some of the detractors of scholasticism who confessed to finding it so heavy and dull as to be obliged to push the tomes away from them, were able to write the absurd trash they did.

It requires a certain amount of grind, a great deal of patience and resolute application to master, even to a moderate extent, the doctrines of the "Summa Theologica." Not all of us have the synthetic power of Aquinas. *"Sunt enim quidam,"* he tells us himself,[4] *"qui veritatem intelligibilem capere non possunt, nisi eis particulatim per singula explicatur; et hoc ex debilitate intellectus eorum contingit."*

The questions in the "Summa Theologica" to which I have already referred—those from Question 50 to Question 64—treat of the existence, the nature, the understanding, the will, the beatitude of the good and the malice and punishment of the evil angels. Certain of these questions are obviously more theological in nature than others, but the rationalistic spirit, so often and so unjustly urged against those who rightly held that faith has nothing to fear and everything to gain from the right use of reason, is to be observed in all.

From the point of view of revelation there is not one of the articles that is in any sense trivial or useless. There are those who would forbid us the luxury of trying to understand the faith that we possess. They would apparently prefer us to remain in a blissful vagueness, trusting to the intuitions of our "personality," the range and play of our higher emotions[5] and affections and the rich variety of our religious experience. They warn us that reason, as, indeed, St. Thomas points out,[6] is at best a feeble instrument and inadequate for coping with the things of God, and do not stop to let us ask why, if we cannot understand it at all, a revelation was ever given to man. They paint the dangers of intellectual freedom and hold up

---

[3] "If the doctrine of Thomas Aquinas could only be got rid of," the heretics "could easily give battle to other Catholic doctors and overcome them, and so scatter the Church."—Beza and Bucer, quoted in "Æterni Patris."

[4] "Summa Theologica," 1a, Q. 55, a. 3.

[5] See "The Place of Emotion in Religion," by the present writer, in *The Month*, July, 1905.

[6] "Contra Gentes," Lib. I., Cap. 2.

the terrifying examples of those whose speculations have led them to renounce their faith, but they do not always put us upon our guard against the no less terrible pitfalls of exalted mysticism, personalism or emotionalism. If there was an Abelard, there was also an Eckhart and a Tauler. The tendency of Ritschilianism is more dangerous than the pronounced free thought of Clifford or Haeckel. They carefully point out to us that man is not a naked intellect, created for the sole purpose of judging of the true and the false, but a complex being, whose every faculty must be dominated by the religion to which each has its definite relation, forgetting that, if intellect is anything at all, it is the only faculty to which a revelation can be addressed, the only faculty by which it can be understood and the supreme judge and arbiter for man of the true nature and worth of every other faculty that he possesses.

Their attitude is not that of the scholastics, and consequently they cannot tolerate scholasticism. It is not that they are afraid of reason; they mistrust it. But reason will claim its rights, and, as I have said, its claim must be allowed; and if these good people are attempting to build a dam of emotion and intuition between the faith and the surge of natural right reason, they are by their action making a public confession of the irrationality of the faith. This was not the attitude of the schools nor was it the position taken up by St. Thomas Aquinas.[7]

From the point of view of pure reason, again, these articles are of the utmost use and excellence. If the complete view of the universe taken be a correct one, an enormous flood of light is thrown upon the whole of creation by these disquisitions upon the nature, faculties and operations of the angels. Even were the data of revelation and historical experience untrue and the rational arguments advanced unsound, in the hypothetic treatment of such questions as the composite nature[8] and individual specific difference[9] of the separated spirits, the mode in which they can be said to be *in place*[10] move locally,[11] pass through intervening space[12] or move in instants,[13] great insight is gained into the purely natural doctrines of hylomorphism, individuation, space, motion and time. And as to the practical utility of Questions 54-60, inclusively, there can be no doubt whatever. Here are included altogether thirty-two articles dealing *ex professo* with the understanding, will and love of the

---

[7] Cfr. "Contra Gentes," Lib. I., Cap. 7.
[8] "Summa Theologica," 1a, Q. 4, aa. 1, 2.
[9] *Ibid*, a. 4.
[10] *Ibid*, Q. 52, a. 1.
[11] *Ibid*, Q. 53, a. 1.
[12] *Ibid*, a. 2.
[13] *Ibid*, a. 3.

angels. They have their parallel only in the scholastic psychology of man, and in this connection they are simply invaluable.

The contrast between the mode of understanding of a spirit in no way subject to the defects and limitations of a sensitive origin of knowledge is not only a study in itself, but helps to clear the extraordinarily encumbered ground of human epistemology. Thus the five articles discussed in Question 50—whether the act of understanding is the substance of the angel or the existence; whether the potentiality to understanding is the essence; whether the distinction between the active and potential intellect is to be allowed, and whether there is any other cognition in the angel than intellectual—and especially the fourth and fifth of these articles—are calculated to help forward to greater precision and accuracy our conceptions as to the nature and sense-origin of humanly acquired knowledge. Still more do Questions 55, 56 and 57 lend themselves to the fuller understanding of the working of the human mind. Do the angels understand by means of species, sense-images or ideas derived from material things? Do the higher spirits possess more universal species (ideas) than those of a lower rank? "I reply by observing," writes the Angelic Doctor in the text of this article, "that some beings are higher than others because they are nearer and more like to that one first Being who is God. Now in God the whole plentitude of intellectual understanding is contained in one act, namely, the divine essence in (per) which God understands all things. And this fullness of understanding is found in intellectual[14] creatures in an inferior manner and less simply. Hence those things that God understands by one act lower intellects know by many; and so much the more by many as the intellect is lower. Thus, therefore, in so far as an angel is higher (in the intellectual scale), so much the more can he apprehend the universality of understandable things by fewer species (ideas); and therefore it is necessary to hold that the concept-forms of the higher angels are more universal than those of the lower, in the sense that each one of them extends itself to more things. And an example of this can to some extent be seen in us. For there are some men who cannot grasp intellectual truth unless it is explained to them step by step and point by point, and this arises from the weakness of their faculty. Others who possess a stronger intellect can seize upon the many in the few (*ex paucis*)."[15]

Here a considerable amount of light is thrown upon the problem

[14] The word used is "intelligibilibus." The saint's use of this term may be explained in the light of his teaching ("Summa Theologica," 1a, Q. 87, a. 3) on intelligibility. The exceedingly interesting question so admirably stated by the Spanish philosopher, Balmez ("Fundamental Philosophy," Chapter XII.), is touched on.

[15] A free translation of "Summa Theologica," 1a, Q. 55,

of the universals around which so great and so prolonged a controversy was waged in the Middle Ages.[16] It is one of the most important points, if not *the* most important point, in the whole of philosophy, and to the solution of this cardinal problem the labors of some three hundred years were devoted. Even now from time to time echoes of that famous disputation are heard, and though the savants and litterati of the nineteenth century do not call each other nominalists, or conceptualists, or realists, the veil that covers the old doctrines is at times worn exceedingly thin. The gamut of possibility in these really great questions is not an extended one; and philosophers of the twentieth as well as of the twelfth century must sing, or croak, within a very limited range of notes. And so we are not altogether surprised to find our old troubadours turning up under an alias and singing the same old tunes to rhymes of their own making and mending.

"Different intellectual beings are differently constituted," writes St. Thomas. "There is an intellect, the divine, which is its own very act of understanding, and so in God it is the same thing for Him to understand that He understands and to understand His own essence, because His essence *is* His act of understanding.

"There is another intellect, that of the angel, that is not its act of understanding, as has been said (Q. liv., aa. 1, 2); still, the primary object of its understanding is its own essence. Hence, although for the angel it is one thing to understand that it understands and another thing to understand its own essence (for there is a distinction of reason between them), yet it simultaneously and in one act understands both; for to understand its own essence is the characteristic perfection of its nature. Simultaneously and in one act the thing is understood with its perfection.

"There is also another intellect, the human, which is not its own act of understanding; nor is the primary object of its understanding its own essence, but something extrinsic to itself, namely, material nature. And therefore that which is first of all known by the human intellect is an object of this kind; and secondarily it has a knowledge of its own act, by means of which the exterior object is known, and in understanding the act the intellect knows itself, for its perfection is the act of understanding."[17]

Neither the extract just given nor the previous one taken from the pages of St. Thomas has the true ring, though I trust they both convey the true sense of the original. As Cardinal Newman so well said: "Translation in itself is a problem how, two languages being

[16] See "Universals and the Illative Sense," by the present writer, in the Dublin *Review* for October, 1905.

[17] "Summa Theologica," Q. 87, a. 3.

given, the nearest approximation may be made in the second to the expression of ideas already conveyed through the medium of the first. The problem almost starts with the assumption that something must be sacrificed, and the chief question is what is the least sacrifice?"[18] Sense or literary grace? Doctrine or language? Thought or grammar? As I have dealt with the subject elsewhere,[19] I need not do more than repeat here that scholastic Latin is a most admirable medium for expressing thought. The extraordinary difficulty that presents itself to a translator is to digest the thought in such wise that he may be able to express it in another language. Practically this can never be done without barbarism and solecism. The best translations of St. Thomas are barbarous. And it is probably more, if not altogether, for this reason that certain self-constituted critics of the scholastics have been so prodigal of condemnatory adjectives. They did not realize or take the pains to learn that any vehicle of thought must be proportioned to the thought that it attempts to convey from mind to mind; and, separated by an almost impassable intellectual gulf from the time-spirit of the schools, they judged, perforce, by what they had, reading little and understanding less[20] of the doctrines put forward, but superciliously anxious to prove their knowledge of classical, pagan, heathen, Latin by finding fault with the grammar of the philosophers. As well might they carp at the style of a Chrysostom or find fault with the language and poetry of a Chaucer or a Spenser!

One does not go to the "Summa Theologica" for either Ciceronian grammar or Horatian style. One goes for thomistic thought. The student of history does not read Cæsar's Commentaries or Herodotus' delightful pages to discover a treatise upon the Ars Poetica; nor does the poet waste his time upon the Iliad or the Æneid in order to discover the records of cosmic history there.

The two extracts that I have given from the "Summa" of St. Thomas are typical. The one throws light upon the other. So it is with all the surprisingly numerous questions and articles and chapters that he devotes to considerations bearing upon the angels. They are characteristically interesting not only on account of the trenchant and defined style of treatment, but also because of the nicety of order and systematic method that holds them together. Students of St. Thomas soon learn how much is hidden in his concise and straightforward sentences. It is only the superficial reader, not realizing the tacit cross-references nor grasping the fact that subsidiary considerations are indicated by a word rather that allowed

[18] "The Church of the Fathers," preface.

[19] "The Language of the Schools," Dublin *Review*, January, 1904.

[20] Witness G. H. Lewes' confession.

to interefere with the main questions, nor, possibly, as familiar as he might be with the finer shades of scholastic meaning, who discovers that the "Summa Theologica" or the "Contra Gentiles" is dry, uninteresting, barbarous, a tissue of mere speculation and hair-splitting.

The method alone indicates greatness of mind. The isolation of the question to be treated, the leaving out of all those interesting yet not vital points connected with it that flash across consciousness as soon as it is dwelt upon, the deft, masterly touches sketching in the more important side lines and relationships, yet without marring the contour or detail of the main question, stamps the work as that of genius.

These questions are not only interesting in themselves, as I have said, but also of great value as side lights upon the psychology and epistemology of human beings. In this connection they should be studied with the questions from 75 onwards, dealing *ex professo* with these latter subjects. Especially interesting are the eight articles included in Question 89. As far back as Question 75, article 6, the incorruptibility of the human soul is proved. But what is incorruptibility or, what is consequent upon it, immortality? A permanence in being after bodily death? Obviously so; and a permanence of intelligence, since the life of the soul is its understanding. But what of the nature of that intelligence? Shall we know God? Shall we know and consort with the angelic spirits? Shall we know—the question is insistent upon every tongue—our own fellows? Of what use is a speculative immortality if all the interest in a continued existence is taken away and a monotonous and monstrous lethargy substituted for it? The piously minded may well be content to contemplate an endless existence filled with the vision of God. But even the most piously disposed mystic may well ask if he shall also know those whom he has loved upon earth. There are none of us whom this question leaves irresponsive. Is an immortality without our loved ones worth having? Would it be tolerable? Let no less a mystic and a saint than Bernard, Abbot of Clairvaux, answer:[21] "Weeping before the members of his community, the man, whom all thought absolutely without feeling, thus speaks of his own flesh and blood, recently borne to the grave. . . . He gives us the impression of a man who has striven to keep back his grief, as he assures us in this case he has done; and then, finding the effort useless, allows it to flow forth as it will, showing to the world what, had it in the beginning been permitted to take its natural course, might never have been suspected—long years of tenderness and deep love purposely concealed from the eyes of the curious.

[21] I quote from an exceptionally interesting article in the Dublin *Review*, October, 1904, from the pen of the Rev. John Freeland.

"'I weep for thee, O dearest Gerard,' he says, 'not because thou needest my tears, but because thou are taken from me. And therefore, perhaps, I should rather weep for myself who drink this cup of bitterness alone. . . . O, would that I had not lost thee! *Oh, that we may meet again! Oh, that, though late, I may some time follow thee whithersoever thou goest!* . . . For O, my brother, the darkness of midnight hath already passed away for thee, and night hath burst into resplendent light over thy joyful soul!'"

Who is there of us who could not borrow the words of St. Bernard to voice our own grief at the loss of one dearly loved? Who is there who would not, in his heart of hearts, echo those intensely human words, "Oh, that we may meet again! Oh, that, though late, I may some time follow thee whithersoever thou goest?" When we have stood beside the open grave and heard the dull thud of the clods as they buried our loved one out of sight, can we contemplate an immortality without this question surging up and overwhelming our mind?

And if the spontaneous questioning of our own souls and the poetry of the saint's sorrowful longing, that poignant grief of St. Bernard of Clairvaux, seem to prompt a hope too natural to be rational, turn to the second article of Question 89 in the "Summa Theologica." There, uninfluenced by the sentiment of the mystic and seemingly devoid of natural "feeling," the Angelic Doctor demonstrates, in the dryest of scholastic phrases, that soul knows soul, and this in a knowledge quite other than that which we now possess, since it is a perfect knowledge. The cross-reference is here obviously to Question 56, article 2, which treats of the angel's knowledge of his fellow angels. And the extraordinarily noticeable difference depends upon the doctrine, to which allusion has already been made, that, whereas all human souls are specifically identical, no two angels are in the same species. One soul naturally knows another because it is "conformed modally to others."[22] The angel knows his fellow by that likeness which he receives from God.[23]

The soul of one man may be more noble than that of another. It may, it is to be supposed, possess a higher degree of intelligence or a stronger will, and this as a soul and not merely because of the excellence of the lower faculties by whose instrumentality it first crossed the threshold of knowledge. Certainly one separated soul may enter upon the new life bearing with it a more profound or a more extended natural knowledge than another. But all human souls, whether in the body or freed from the cloying companionship of unspiritualized matter, since they are all human, are specifically

[22] "Summa Theologica," 1a, Q. 89, a. 2.
[23] *Ibid*, Q. 56, a. 2.

the same. While the angels stand in unequal ranks, angel separated from angel by the whole distance of a species, understanding each other by those *inditae rationes,* loving each other with a natural love[24] as far as they are naturally alike, communicating with each other in that angelic speech of which the doctors of the schools treat,[25] the souls of men know each other perfectly by reason of their specific identity, and knowing each other, they are drawn together in the bonds of love, and hold converse one with another[26] even with respect to events taking place in this world. Here, again, no little advantage to a thorough understanding of the psychology of the separated soul and of man accrues from a right grasp of angelic epistemology and a comparison of the two doctrines.

From what has already been said, though it is the merest outline of what proves upon further acquaintance to be a most fascinating study, it will be seen that the articles on the angels are not out of place in the writings of St. Thomas. It was not a wasted or a misdirected energy on his part that led to their writing. Indeed, in view of the extraordinary chorus of approbation and praise of the Thomistic teaching coming from religious orders, university bodies, Popes and councils,[27] it would savor of impertinence and egotism even to suppose that any subject he treated was unworthy of the attention of serious men.

When the Archbishop of Rouen counselled his students to eschew as inquisitive subtleties[28] the questions we have been considering, he did not mean—he surely could not have meant—that they were obscure questions or subtle in the bad sense of the word or useless speculations. We can understand his point. In these days of "short courses" and epitomized knowledge the student must master the maximum of absolutely necessary learning in the minimum of time. The priest is better equipped for his work by being acquainted with dogmatic and moral—and especially moral—theology, even if he has not a very profound acquaintance with other sciences. Like that of modern science, the tendency of theological study is utilitarian; the one almost, though not altogether or always, by its nature, the other grudgingly and by the force of contrary circumstances. And one could hardly expect a profound knowledge of St. Thomas on the angels where he can hope to find, at best, but rudimentary conceptions of the nature and working of the human understanding.

But give the student time. His course of study has not ceased

---

[24] There is a distinction made with regard to this natural love in the "Summa," Q. 60, a. 4.

[25] *Ibid,* Q. CVII., aa. 1, 2, 4 and 5.

[26] "Summa Theologica," Q. 89, a. 8, ad lum.

[27] See the encyclical, "Æterni Patris."

[28] "Dix Ans d'Episcopat."

because the doors of the class room have closed behind him. Let him add to the thumbed class books upon his shelves that he has brought with him from the seminary the untainted source of Thomistic doctrine, the "Summa Theologica" of Thomas himself; and, as in the intervals of his parochial duties he refreshes his memory from the one, so let him proceed, day by day, to the mastery of the other. The "Contra Gentiles," the "Quæstiones Disputatae," the "Quodlibeta" will all be on his shelves ere long and will show the tell-tale marks of constant use. He will find there copious material for his sermons and lucid points for his instructions. His knowledge will grow, not in passing over what is best in modern thought—for modern books and reviews will find a place beside the ancient tomes—but by forming itself upon the inimitable method of the schools. And as the great underlying principles take possession of his mind he will find all the information that he has acquired from sources ancient and modern becoming fused together into one compact whole. He will discover that the knowledge that appeared fragmentary, the information that seemed ephemeral, the fact that was negligible, in reality all form-parts of a system; and as his thought crystallizes on the lines of the great thinkers of the Middle Ages, he will realize the relationships, the cross references, the solidarity that denotes a complete and a supremely rational philosophy. And if, as is probable, while he makes the subject more and more his own, his own intellectual grasp and synthetic power grow as well, he will understand how and why it is that St. Thomas is known as the Angelic Doctor.

We are familiar with the omission of the scholastic period from one of the histories of philosophy on the ground that the thought of the time was occupied upon theological rather than philosophical problems, and hence could hardly be of interest to the philosopher or furnish material for the historian of philosophy. I should be loath to think that the excuse was put forward to save Mr. Lewes from the accusation that, had he dealt with scholasticism, very possibly might have been made—of knowing nothing whatever about the subject. The few references and quotations made in this article are enough to show that the excuse is worthless. No history of philosophy that omits scholasticism can be justly put forward as a record of human thought, nor can it be claimed for it that it is in any sense a complete history of philosophy. Take, for example, the Greek philosophers. What is there of value in Greek thought that did not pass through the acute minds of Plato and Aristotle? And what thought of Plato or Aristotle that was not assimilated and reconstructed by the acuter thinkers of the golden age of philosophy? Or, again, what is there in the philosophies of more modern thinkers that was not in

some sense anticipated by those master minds? It might be said that "truth will out;" that in every system certain parallels will be found, because there must be some truth in all systems. But what is worthy of note is that in the philosophy of St. Thomas one does not find those *impasses* so familiar to students of other philosophies, and one does find all the truths, coördinated and linked together, that are to be discovered singly and scattered through other systems.

To say that the mediæval philosophers were theologians as well, is to state a fact; but that all philosophers are theologians is a truism. The scholastic doctors were theologians, and they were philosophers in order that they might be more capable theologians. They were philosophers, and philosophers who had reached the culminating point of philosophy in the rational recognition of the possibility of theology. But their philosophy never clashes with the truth that they accept as coming direct to them from the God of philosophy; and their theology, rightly or profoundly understood, is never in conflict with their philosophy, since it is in the crucible of philosophy, of reason, of understanding that revelation becomes humanly acceptable.

How, we may ask, and ask again, in company with St. Thomas, can a revelation be in the truest sense revealed if it is incomprehensible? And how can it be understood if our natural faculty is absolutely incapable of understanding it?

The possibility of a revelation depends upon four truths: the existence of God, the existence of man, the possibility of God speaking to man and the possibility of man understanding the communication of God. Deny any of these truths and revealed religion is incredible and impossible. And since understanding on the part of man must be the work of the natural faculty—illuminated by grace, if you will, in some of the truths which transcend the normal power of reason—the functions of that natural faculty must be admitted and its logical claims granted.

Here in the exposition by St. Thomas of the doctrine concerning the angels a fusion, as it is, of the human and the divine, is to be found the most ample refutation of the two false and thoroughly illogical positions. Revelation is useless and impossible without mind. Philosophy is true philosophy even when concerned principally with the data of revelation.

The treatment of the subject is characteristically in keeping with the position of the scholastic philosophers. Revelation is admirably safeguarded. The fullest claims of natural reason are allowed to the fullest extent. With what care does St. Thomas labor, not to collate texts of Scripture or phrases taken from patristic writings, but to throw the searchlight of reason upon the problems in all the

multiplicity of their detail. With what nicety does he refer the knowledge we have from revelation of the "ministering spirits" to the immutable underlying principles of pure human thought. How, in the strength of those principles, does his mental vision perceive the fallacies and discrepancies of other systems and avoid and even foresee similar pitfalls.

It is a liberal education to have read the works of St. Thomas and to have grasped, even if only partially, his method of dealing with the problems that he faces. It is little short of a revelation to make the acquaintance of the man, the philosopher and the saint in his writings. Such a knowledge as comes from their careful perusal lays bare his mind, the highest and noblest psychological product of the thirteenth century. And in that knowledge, for whoever cares to acquire it, lies the key to the history of the Middle Ages. Checkered and alien, as it seems to us, its course often turned aside, as that of any other period of history, by human passions, irrational and incalculable forces, it is in the movement and flow of thought alone that its meaning will be found. The events of those ages of groping and attempt at synthesis that led up to it are understood as much in its light as in their own; nay, even more in the light of what was their natural and logical complement. The decadence, the wave almost of barbarism that followed, could have been foretold in the decrepitude and decay of later scholasticism. From the stagnation and decay of thought new thought-systems and new thoughts without system were born, fragmentary, one-sided, conflicting among themselves and, almost necessarily, revolutionary in nature or tendency. The consequence was a breaking up of institutions, a babel of tongues and its end was sordid. Claiming as it did to free the minds of men from the tyranny of systems and their consequences, the new degraded thought did no more than pave the way to an intellectual chaos, from which only now, if indeed even now, the human mind seems to be emancipating itself.

It is all very well for the humanists or the scientists or the mystics to cavil at scholastic philosophy. Neither humanism, nor science, nor mysticism has as yet enriched the human race with an explanation of the world. When the true worth of scholasticism is adequately realized, their cavils will serve but to show the limitations of their own mental horizon. And while these broken and discarded thought-systems, fere arcs and segments that could never have been perfect circles, pass away into the limbo of forgotten lore, a fate from which not the wit, nor the ingenuity, nor the learning of their originators could save them; while they serve no better purpose than that of fallen landmarks for the curious investigator of the vagaries of thought, the complete thought-system of the schools, traced in a

finished curve by St. Thomas Aquinas, the Angel of the Schools, will still remain intangible and unassailable.

Rising above the dust and debris of centuries of philosophic thought, raising itself even from the necessarily crude science, inexact observation and faulty experiment that were in a sense incorporated into it, the philosophy of St. Thomas will endure, at once the standing monument to the greatness of a bygone age and the earnest of a reconstruction in future thought. And in the central philosophy that suffers nothing when a more exact takes the place of the crude attempts of contemporary science within it, the treatment of such problems as those of the separated spirits, the "Angels of God" of revelation, the "minds" or "intelligences" of natural thought, has its due and fitting place. It is safe to say that the human, together with what may by a misnomer be designated as the angelic psychology taught by St. Thomas, is the finger-post pointing the groping systems of to-day towards the truth. Without some such a teaching those systems will remain obscure, unsatisfying, inconclusive; with it they may reach the goal of all true philosophers—the highest truth attainable by human reason.

E. Aveling.

London, England.

# Scientific Chronicle

## THE WORK OF THE CARNEGIE INSTITUTION.

It is very probable that the majority of people know of the institution which Andrew Carnegie established in Washington four years ago with an endowment of $10,000,000 and an annual income of $500,000 merely as one of the many large benefactions of that noted philanthropist. The subsequent organization of the project and the work accomplished since the foundation are, however, of great scientific as well as popular interest. It cannot be said that either the organization or the work has satisfied everybody. This was, perhaps, the inevitable result of the dreams of many men of science who imagined that the institution would visit every scientist with a pet research and remove his financial embarrassment like a fairy godmother. The gratifying fact is that a large amount of valuable work in scientific research has already been carried out, and elaborate and ambitious plans laid out for the future. The report of the new president of the institution gives us an opportunity of giving the readers of the QUARTERLY an outline of its past and projected achievements.

At present there are four fields of endeavor in which the institution is rendering assistance. These are: 1. Large projects, involving continuous research, with special equipment and a corps of investigators. These now number ten. 2. Small projects by experts in particular departments. About three hundred allotments have already been made here. 3. Tentative investigations, carried on by young investigators who give promise of becoming or who, it is hoped, will develop into investigators of more than ordinary ability. 4. Aid in publishing valuable works, whether written by the institution's investigators or not. A limited number of grants have been made in the third field and about forty volumes published under grant number four. These two grants, with the second, cover a wide field of science, but as they do not reach the first division grants in importance, we think it better to confine our attention almost wholly to the ten larger projects, which are, it would seem, to be the chief care of the institution in future. These ten larger projects are: Experimental evolution in biology, marine biology, desert plant biology, horticulture, economics and sociology, history, geophysics, nutrition, solar physics, terrestrial magnetism.

The investigations in experimental evolution in biology are made

under the supervision of Charles B. Davenport, those in marine biology are looked after by Alfred G. Mayer, while Messrs. D. T. MacDougal and F. V. Coville are in charge of the desert laboratory for studying desert plant biology. Anticipations as to the results to be gained from these biological investigations are great. A marine laboratory has been built at Tortugas, Florida, and an elaborate station at Cold Spring Harbor, N. Y., for experimental evolution, which have already been visited and used by leading zoölogists and botanists. The desert botanical laboratory has for its object the investigation of the conditions in deserts affecting plant growth, in order to discover, if possible, some class of flora that will thrive in deserts and thus be an aid in rendering the arid parts of this and other countries fertile and habitable. The horticultural work of the institution is in close connection with the desert botanical work and is concerned with the interpretation and publication to the world of the remarkable achievements of Mr. Luther Burbank, who has received very substantial financial aid to enable him to carry on his experiments in plant breeding.

The next two departments, those of economics and sociology and of history, or historical research, are evidence of the comprehensive efforts of the institution, which is clearly not applying its resources solely to research in physical science. The former, under the direction of Dr. Carroll D. Wright, has, in the words of the report, "undertaken a comprehensive project which should bring, in a few years, extensive contributions to the social and economic history of the United States, and probably also equally important data for a forecast of American social and economic development." The latter, of which Professor Andrew C. McLaughlin has been the head, was one of the first to be organized. It has already taken a high place in the esteem of students of history, as is evidenced by the wide use made by them of the publications and discoveries made and by the constantly increasing demand for the documents issued. The announcement is made that Professor McLaughlin has resigned and been succeeded by Professor J. Franklin Jameson, formerly professor of history in the University of Chicago.

The department of geophysical research has an especial interest for students of geology. The application of the experimental method to the elucidation of problems connected with the mechanics of the earth's crust is bound to be very fruitful in results for the earth sciences. Under the able direction of Professor Frank D. Adams, of McGill University, Montreal, and of Dr. George F. Becker and Dr. Arthur L. Day, of the U. S. Geological Survey, researches are being made which aim to determine the modes of formation and the physical properties of the rocks of the earth's crust. The report

notes that "certain kinds of rocks have already been made artificially, and the making of others is only a question of time and the application of available resources." Incidentally our knowledge of the properties of matter under new conditions is being markedly increased. Every geologist must cherish the hope that this department will later turn its attention to other problems, such as the dynamics of rivers and glaciers and the accurate determination of the causes of land uplift and depression, problems vital alike to the geologist and physiographer.

Two of the remaining projects are partially known to the readers of the Chronicle, where some account has already been given of Professor Chittenden's work on nutrition and of the magnetic survey of the world undertaken by the Carnegie Institution. Professor Chittenden is to continue his investigations at Yale University, with Professor F. B. Mendel as an associate. They are studying the chemical and physiological processes and effects in man arising from the qualities and quantities of foods he consumes. In this same department Professor F. G. Benedict will study the mechanical efficiency of man by means of a specially devised apparatus at Wesleyan University, and Dr. T. B. Osborne, of the Connecticut Agricultural Experiment Station, is engaged in an exhaustive determination of the chemical properties of that large group of foodstuffs known as the proteids.

The department of solar physics seems to be the favored child of the institution. For researches into the physical constitution of the sun and his rôle in the solar and stellar systems of the visible universe an observatory has been erected on Mount Wilson, in California, which it is hoped to have quite completed within a year. The site chosen is an admirable one, the condition of the atmosphere being unusually favorable, while the fact that the direction of the observatory is entrusted to the care of Professor George E. Hall is a guarantee that it will be efficiently administered. Already some valuable observations have been made during the past summer by a party under the direction of the late Secretary Langley, of the Smithsonian Institution, on the solar constant, and by Professor E. E. Barnard, of the University of Chicago, who by installing the Bruce telescope of the Yerkes Observatory on the site, has been extending his remarkable photographic charts of the Milky Way.

We give, in conclusion, a summary of the most important minor projects taken from President Woodward's report: 1. The archæological and geological researches of Professor Raphael Pumpelly in Turkestan. The first volume of a report on these researches has been issued during the year and a second is in prepartion. 2. The preparation by Professor Lewis Boss of a fundamental catalogue

giving the precise positions of about six thousand stars, embracing all stars from the brightest down to the sixth magnitude. 3. The researches on the moon by Professor Simon Newcomb. 4. The precise quantitative investigations of Professor A. A. Noyes and T. W. Richards in chemistry. 5. The comprehensive researches in geology and cosmology by Professor T. C. Chamberlain. 6. The work of Professor Carl Barns on the nucleation of the dust-full atmosphere; of Professor E. W. Scripture on researches in phonetics; of Professor G. R. Wieland on American cycads, and the work of Mr. W. L. Tower on the evolution of beetles.

---

## ARTIFICIAL SILK AND HORSEHAIR.

Somewhat over twenty-five years ago the artificial production of indigo was made commercially possible. Within the last few years artificial camphor has become a staple article of commerce, while only recently the announcement has been made that we shall soon have artificial albumen for our consumption. Some years ago it was discovered that cotton if placed in a solution of sodium hydroxide of suitable concentration underwent a remarkable change, the individual strands becoming circular in cross-section and straight instead of twisted along their length. If washed and dyed after this process it was capable of showing a lustre much resembling that of silk. The process was known as "mercerizing." The product has been called by a variety of names, " silkateen," for instance, and has been much used for needlework and the manufacture of dress fabrics. But this was still cotton. The nearness of its approach to silk, however, seems to have stimulated the endeavor of investigators to attempt the manufacture of something more closely resembling that product; if possible, to make silk itself. The story of the achievement that led to the success thus far attained is a beautiful example of patient endeavor in a difficult field of investigation, for the desired result was not attained until after thirteen years of work, from 1885 to 1898.

If we treat cellulose in the form of pure cotton wool with a cold mixture of equal molecular weights of the strongest sulphuric and nitric acids, and afterwards thoroughly wash it and dry it by exposure of air, it is converted into cellulose hexanitrate, known also as pyroxylin or gun-cotton, which is insoluble in ether, alcohol or a mixture of the two. If the mixture of sulphuric and nitric acids be slightly diluted with water, the product is soluble gun-cotton, which is a mixture of cellulose nitrates lower than the hexanitrate, *i. e.*, the

penta-, tetra-, tri- and di-nitrates. This will dissolve in a mixture of ether and alcohol and will be deposited as an extraordinarily thin film, if the solution is poured over a surface and the ether and alcohol allowed to evaporate. Such thin films on glass are used in the "wet-plate process" of photography. Now the silk-worm spins the silk to form its cocoon by exuding a fluid through its so-called spirmcults, which fluid hardens on exposure to the air. So a process was devised in imitation of this method of the silk-worm, by which the collodion, as the solution described above was called, was forced out under pressure through a number of minute orifices into water, when it hardened immediately and was then wound on bobbins and subsequently dried and dyed. The result was a fair imitation of silk not easily distinguished from genuine silk by the casual observer, although possessing only twenty per cent. of the strength of silk, each strand of which is as strong as a strand of steel of equal cross-section. It has the defect, and it is a serious one, of being very hygroscopic and of losing sixty per cent. of its strength when wet, but it is hoped to remedy this defect before long. Some other substances are used instead of collodion, and various fabrics have been made, among them an artificial straw.

The artificial horsehair mentioned is made in a manner analogous to the artificial silk from a mixture known as viscose. It is in all respects like the real article and has been used in the manufacture of "horsehair" hats and other articles of dress and ornament.

---

## THE DIAMOND SHOALS LIGHTHOUSE.

The Diamond Shoals extend for eighteen miles out into the Atlantic off the point of Cape Hatteras on the North Carolina coast. The perils of these shoals have been long known to mariners, and yet there was no light near enough to be of service, the lighthouse on the outer bar being too far in and the lightship too far seaward. The difficulties to be overcome in locating a lighthouse on the outer shoal were exceedingly great, and a recent attempt failed. An enterprising firm of engineers, Harriman Brothers by name, have devised a plan that will doubtless result in the lighthouse being built in a few years. The essential details follow. A massive steel caisson is to be built in a shipyard and towed to the site of the proposed lighthouse. It will be made in the form of a truncated cone, 108 feet in diameter at the bottom, 50 feet in diameter at the top and 80 feet high, and is so constructed that the excavations necessary to imbed it in the sands to a depth of about 26 feet can be carried on

within. The sand in which it will be fixed can easily support eight or ten tons per square foot, but the finished light will nowhere exert a pressure of more than 3.6 tons per square foot. When the caisson has been sunk it will be filled with concrete and an apron of granite rip-rap extending out 75 feet will be spread in the direction of greatest exposure. Thereupon the superstructure, 150 feet high, which will be of steel and will carry a first-class light visible fifteen miles, will be erected. On it a life-saving as well as a lighthouse service will be maintained.

---

## GENERAL NOTES.

Oil Production in 1905.—The *Scientific American* gives several graphic representations of the vast amount of oil, over 219,000,000 barrels of 42 gallons each, produced throughout the world during the past year. The barrels, it calculates, would, if placed end to end, encircle the earth five times about the equator, and would then lap over one thousand miles. The oil would fill a tank 1,500 feet long, 250 feet wide and over 3,300 feet high. The refined oil amounted to 3,025,000,000 gallons. If a student's lamp with a reservoir 1,200 feet high and 650 feet in diameter were constructed, it would contain this oil, which would burn night and day for one month and give a light of 3,628,260.000 standard candle power, equal to the light produced by three million ordinary arc lights.

The Work of the Government Surveys.—Last year the United States Coast and Geodetic Survey completed the line of precise levels connecting the Atlantic Ocean and the Gulf of Mexico with the Pacific Ocean, as we gather from the report of the Superintendent, Mr. O. H. Tittman. We quote further from this report in reference to this achievement: "The three principal connections with sea level are at Sandy Hook, New Jersey; at Biloxi, Mississippi, and at Seattle, Washington. The distance between Sandy Hook and Seattle along the shortest line of leveling of the highest degree of accuracy is 7,400 kilometers, and the similar distance between Biloxi and Seattle is 5,700 kilometers. This leveling is a portion of the precise leveling operations which will eventually furnish standard elevations in the United States, upon which the extensive operations of the Reclamation Service can be based, and for use of geographers, civil engineers and surveyors, and for physical investigations relating to the planet on which we live." Another portion of the report contains the following item of interest: "The year was notable by the large number of magnetic storms which sensibly

affected the compass direction, this being the period of maximum sun-spot activity. On the average there have occurred two such storms monthly, which deflected the compass by one-quarter of a degree or more. A comparatively large number of earthquake records were also obtained during the year, the most notable one being the Indian earthquake of last April."

Mr. Alfred H. Brooks, of the United States Geological Survey, gives us the following summary of what is known of Alaska in the *Popular Science Monthly* for January:

| | Square Miles. |
|---|---|
| Explorations by United States Geological Survey | 80,000 |
| Geologic and topographic reconnoissance surveys | 60,000 |
| Explorations by other departments | 50,000 |
| Coastal province, shore line surveyed by Coast Survey and some geological surveys made by Geological Survey | 120,000 |
| Unmapped and practically unexplored | 310,000 |
| Total area of Alaska | 620,000 |

Some Recent Discoveries of Fossils.—There is a fascination for student and layman alike in the discovery and restoration of extinct reptiles of past geological eras. The activity shown during the last few years in investigations along these lines has advanced the study of vertebrate paleontology to a point where a reclassification was necessary. This is notably shown when the skeleton of a reptile, which has been named Tyrannosaurus Rex, was unearthed by a party of explorers from the American Museum of Natural History in New York city. The monster mentioned was thirty-nine feet in length and stood nineteen feet in height. It is of special interest from the fact that it was a land animal. The remains of land animals are much less frequently preserved than the remains of amphibia or water animals, as decay on the surface of the land is complete. The only chance of the preservation of the skeleton of a land animal would be when the animal perished by drowning or when the body was washed into the water and was gradually covered by the accumulating sediments that were afterwards consolidated.

From Russia comes the news of the interesting discovery of skeletons of extinct reptiles in nodules that local road builders had been in the habit of extracting from the sandy cliffs of the river Dwina, near Archangel, in Northern Russia. The discovery was made by Professor Amalitzky, of Warsaw, a few years ago. He has since revealed several skeletons of the extinct Pariasaurus, a vegetarian reptile about as large as an ox, but not so high in the

legs, as well as the remains of a huge carnivorous reptile with a skull two feet long and enormous tiger-like teeth, which has been named Inostransevia, a name as terrible as the monster it designates. This reptile probably preyed upon Pariasaurus.

Sicily's New Rival in Sulphur Production.—Most of the sulphur of commerce has come from the Island of Sicily. For a long time extensive deposits were known to exist in Louisiana beneath a layer of difficult quicksand, which could not be reached by freezing or by sinking metallic-lined shafts, except at a cost that appeared prohibitory. So pipes ten inches in diameter were sunk to a depth of about 450 feet. Sulphur melts at about 240 degrees F. Accordingly superheated water was forced down the pipes, and the liquid sulphur was drawn up through a second tube within the main pipe. About 350,000 tons of sulphur are thus being taken out per year.

A New Process for the Manufacture of Hydrogen.—Commercial hydrogen has usually been made by the action of sulphuric acid on iron or zinc. A new method is the use of the reaction of alkaline hydrates on metallic aluminum. The reaction is $2Al+3NaOH=3H+AlO^3Na^3$. The principal point in favor of the new process is that five kilogrammes of material per cubic meter of gas are needed, as against seven kilogrammes in the old process. This is probably what commended its use to the Russian aerostatic corps during the recent war. Its cost is much higher than the cost of the acid process.

M. J. Ahern, S. J.

Boston, Mass.

# Book Reviews

THE LIFE AND WRITINGS OF ST. PATRICK, with appendices, etc. By the *Most Rev. Dr. Healy,* Archbishop of Tuam. Pp. 754. Dublin: M. H. Gill & Son, Ltd., Upper O'Connell street; Sealy, Bryers & Walker, Middle Abbey street. New York: Benziger Brothers.

A new life of St. Patrick is always in order and always welcome, but it has a special fitness at this time, when the intellectual, industrial and political revival in Ireland is assuming large and lasting proportions. The study of the life of their apostle and patron will fill Irishmen at such a time with the true spirit—the desire to advance their temporal interests in such a manner as to conserve their eternal welfare. They can do this only by holding fast to that sterling faith and morality which they have received from their ancestors, and which they learned from St. Patrick, and which they preserved at every sacrifice. But let the author speak:

"Our chief purpose in writing this new life of St. Patrick, when so many lives already exist, is to give a fuller, and we venture to hope, more exact account of the saint's missionary labors in Ireland than any that has appeared since the Tripartite Life was first written. For this purpose we have not only studied Colgan's great work and made ourselves familiar with the really valuable publications of our own times, but we have, when practicable, personally visited all the scenes of the saint's labors, both at home and abroad, so as to be able to give a local coloring to the dry record, and also to catch up, as far as possible, the echoes, daily growing fainter, of the once vivid traditions of the past.

"We have no new views to put forward. We shall seek to follow the authority of the ancient writers of the acts of St. Patrick, which we regard as in the main trustworthy. Those who do not like miracles can pass them over, but the ancient writers believed in them, and even when purely imaginary these miraculous stories have an historical and critical value of their own.

"We find it convenient to classify our authorities into three divisions. The *ancient* authorities are those that flourished before the Anglo-Norman invasion of Ireland, that is, before A. D. 1172. The *mediæval* authorities will include all those who make reference to St. Patrick's acts down to the beginning of the seventeenth century. The *modern* authorities will comprehend the rest, including Colgan and Usher, who have written from that date (A. D. 1600) to the present time.

"We have resolved, however, to follow in the main the guidance

of the ancient authorities, who, if credulous in things supernatural, had no motive but to write the truth, so far as it was known to them, for the instruction and edification of posterity. There was then only one Church, and they could have had no motive in representing St. Patrick to be anything else than what he was known to them—a great and successful Christian missionary of the Catholic Church.

"Those ancient authorities are in substantial agreement on all the main points of our apostle's history. Some shallow critics of our own time, by unduly indulging in what is mere speculation, have brought confusion into the acts of St. Patrick, but this confusion, like the morning mist on the mountain side, is rapidly passing away. We shall not follow their example; rather we shall adhere to the ancient authorities, and in so doing we follow the footsteps of the really great Irish scholars of modern times, like Colgan, Usher and O'Flaherty, who paid due regard to those ancient authorities, and under their guidance gave their own lives, with brilliant success, to the study of Irish history and antiquities.

"The writings of St. Patrick himself must naturally be made the basis of any reliable history of the saint. There is no doubt that the Confession and the Epistle to Coroticus were, as the Book of Armagh says of the former, originally written by his own hand. Every statement, therefore, in any life of St. Patrick, ancient or modern, clearly inconsistent with the tenor of these documents must be rejected without hesitation.

"Concerning the miracles related in most of the lives the reader will form his own judgment. Some of the stories are, in our opinion, of their own nature incredible; others are ridiculous, and several are clearly inconsistent with Patrick's own statement in the Confession. But we cannot reject a story merely because it is miraculous. The Confession itself records several miracles, and we are by no means prepared to say that St. Patrick was either deceived or a deceiver. The most famous lives of the great saints of that age are full of narratives of the miraculous. St. Athanasius wrote a life of St. Anthony, Sulpicius Severus has left a beautiful life of St. Martin, Paulinus of Nola has given us an authentic life of St. Felix—these were great prelates and accomplished scholars who had an intimate knowledge of those of whom they wrote, yet we find miracles recorded as undoubted events in every page of their narratives. The absence of the miraculous in any Patrician document is, therefore, no proof of its earlier date or more authentic character, as some modern critics seem to think. The most authentic and eloquent writings of that age are filled with such narratives of the miraculous, and the miracles were attested by most trustworthy witnesses and are narrated as undoubted facts by contemporary writers. In this

work our purpose is not controversial; it is to show St. Patrick as he was known to his contemporaries and their immediate successors who had known the man or received the living stories of his disciples. Most people will think such a narrative is of far more value from every point of view than the speculations of some of our modern critics and philologists, who would rather do away with St. Patrick altogether than admit that he got his mission from Rome.

"The manifold variations in the spelling of Irish words, and especially of Irish proper names, present great difficulty to a writer on Irish subjects and render it almost impossible to adopt a uniform system. As we have, on the whole, followed the guidance of the Rolls Tripartite, both as to the Irish text and its English version, we have thought it desirable to adopt also its system of spelling the Irish proper names. No doubt many of its forms are now archaic; still they exhibit, we think, the language, especially in this matter of proper names, in simpler and purer forms than those which are at present in use; and, moreover, tend to preserve a uniformity of usage which is surely to be desired. Hence we have adopted as a rule the spelling of the Tripartite, especially in proper names, except in the case of certain well-known words, where a departure from the existing usage might be misleading."

---

THE KEY TO THE WORLD'S PROGRESS. Being an Essay on Historical Logic. By *Charles Stanton Devas, M. A. Oxon.*, sometime examiner in political economy at the Royal University of Ireland. 12mo., pp. 321. Longmans, Green & Co., 39 Paternoster Row, London; New York and Bombay. 1906.

Those of our readers who know the "Manual of Political Economy," written for the Stonyhurst Philosophical Series by Mr. Devas, will not need to be told that the present work is well done. The encomiums which the learned author merited on the appearance of that book will, no doubt, be repeated on this occasion. The purpose of the writer and his defense, if one be needed, are so well set forth in the first part of the book that we shall quote at length without any apology:

"Many writers have sought in recent years and many still seek a meaning in man's history, an explanation of the course of society, a forecast of its future. Such names as the growth of civilization, the philosophy of history, the science of sociology, social dynamics or social evolution are some of those chosen to express a science as yet desired rather than attained, which is to solve the riddle of the universe. The keenness of the desire is shown by the eager welcome of one theory of evolution after another, though as yet

their apparent deficiency is their common failure to agree with the detailed facts of history. All the while the need of valid theory grows daily greater. The very progress in historical research during the last twenty-five years has rendered specialization a necessity both for teachers and students; only a few years within a restricted area can be effectively portrayed by any one man, and without some general theory to be our guiding star we must lose our way and cannot reach a fit estimate even of the narrow time and place which are the special object of our study. We must have first a framework into which our portion may be fitted, a totality of which it may be reckoned a part.

"But who will provide a guiding principle in harmony with history and statistics? Who can find order among materials so complicated and obscure? Who can hope to succeed where so many have failed, and to be borne safely through this rugged pass already white with the bones of a thousand theories?

"Perhaps, indeed, it may be asked what is the need after all of any historical theory? Cannot we suffer historians without prejudgment to pursue their narrative in peace and the facts to speak for themselves? But facts themselves are dumb, and a historian is no purveyor of an indiscriminate collection of facts, is no unscientific chronicler, but precisely one whose narrative is the fruit of a process of reasoning. For out of the vast mass of recorded facts, a confused and unintelligible heap, he must select what is pertinent, relevant, important, characteristic. Even as a skilled lawyer extracts from a mass of evidence what is pertinent to the question at issue, so the historian must pass his materials through a series of sieves of increasing fineness before they are ready for history; he must know what special facts are to be searched for, must grasp what is worth remembering, discern amid a crowd of trifles the leading features of the society of which he writes, show order and drift amid the maze of facts, and among those that deserve any mention determine their proper place and relative importance.

"But to do this he must have something previous to his observation, some previously established general propositions, some theoretical anticipations, some criterion to judge what is relevant or irrelevant, what is characteristic or merely exceptional, what is of vital or little importance; and any simple inductive process is triply confused in the case of historical science by the multiplicity of causes, by their complicated interaction, by the frequent loss certain or suspected of many pertinent facts that have dropped from the historical record. And the example of serious historians shows that it is no mere accumulation of facts taken at random nor a blind induction which guides them and leads them to such contra-

dictory results, but rather for each historian his own implicit or explicit assumptions, tacit understandings, an impalpable notion of reasonableness, critical feeling, personal conceptions and historical tact, that determine his choice of facts and the issue of his argument.

"A theory therefore is needed beforehand; no gazing at facts will itself provide one. Before we enter the labyrinth we must have a clue and a lamp before we enter the forest of obscurity. Antecedent to any history we need a philosophy of history for the selection, the adjustment, the appreciation, the limitation of manifold material. Unity is before and above all number; the whole must precede the parts, and 'in order to have possession of truth at all we must have the whole truth,' and if we have not a true view we must make for ourselves a false one, as every day can be seen in the extravagances of undisciplined talent and the narrowness of complacent ignorance. As of knowledge in general, so of historical knowledge in particular, there must be some architectonic science that is the arbiter of the claims and place of the manifold specialists. If history is not to be aimless and unprofitable, we must in some way map out the universe, know the relative disposition of things and see in history a various and complicated drama with interacting parts and grand significance. 'You must be above your knowledge, not under it, or it will oppress you; and the more you have of it the greater will be the load.' Moreover, to history as to all knowledge applies the principle that nearly every statement may be in a sense true and yet may be perverted and made false because it is not the whole truth; and that what is true under one aspect only is therefore altogether insufficient. The political exhortation to think imperially can be transferred with greater precision and certainty to the scientific field. A high protecting power, a sovereign science maps out the territory of each subordinate science, 'acts as umpire between truth and truth and assigns all to their due order of precedence.' If, then, we are not to confess our failure and idly acquiesce in a barren skepticism, we need an imperial theory of history that shall serve as a fruitful hypothesis, and that the severest test of ascertained fact shall not be able to dissolve."

The author might have added that another very strong argument in favor of a true and standard philosophy of history to which all historians should conform is the necessity of preventing each historian, large and small, important and unimportant, competent and incompetent, from playing the philosopher. Of history it may with special truth be said: there are many chroniclers, but few philosophers. The author before us should not go astray, because he has chosen the master guide, John Henry Newman. In his preface he says:

"Let this preface serve me to make profession of following as my guide and teacher the great master of the nineteenth century, John Henry Newman, who, looking before and after, foresaw the intellectual problems of the future, and whose work, though part was concerned with transient controversies and peculiar opinions of his own time, was mainly concerned with lasting needs and chronic infirmities of our nature—Newman, who by some even now is not yet understood, and for many years in time past was covered by a cloud of misunderstanding, the inevitable penalty of intellectual pre-ëminence.

"To be linked even in some slight way to so great a name is not an unworthy ambition; or to join, however imperfectly, in the task of sifting and sorting his work, leaving aside those portions that the fashions of controversy or the progress of historical study have rendered obsolete, making more accessible those portions that are for all time, and in this particular volume giving to the logic and history of Newman an economic sociological setting."

---

GESCHICHTE DER PAEPSTE SEIT DEM AUSGANG DES MITTELALTERS. Von *Ludwig Pastor*. Vol IV., Part I. Herder: Freiburg and St. Louis. Price, $2.85 net.

The long-awaited fourth volume of "Pastor's History of the Popes" has finally made its appearance; or, to speak more accurately, has begun to appear. We have the first half of it, covering the reign of Leo X., probably the most disastrous in the history of the Papacy. Personally the tenth Leo had little influence upon the course of events and possibly less appreciation of their importance. His official name was a quaint misnomer; he was anything but a lion. Like Charles I. of England or Louis XVI. of France, he was amiable and mild in character at a time when these qualities spelt weakness. Pastor regrets that at so critical a period a Hildebrand was not seated in the Chair of St. Peter. It may be questioned if even a Hildebrand could have stemmed the rising tide of irreligion which was sweeping over Europe; but at least he would have made a strong and determined effort to do so. Leo and his nephew, Clement VII., were content with the maintenance of a passive attitude and incurred the censure of being more solicitous for the advancement of Medicean interests than for the defense of the cause of Christ. It cannot surprise us that Dr. Pastor, after his exhaustive study of Julius II., should feel scant enthusiasm in tracing the story of Leo X., who completely lacked the great qualities

of his predecessor. He draws attention to the fact that it was Julius rather than Leo who was the true protector, instigator and Maecenas of art and artists, and that for centuries Leo X. has been credited with undue importance in the field that has been considered Leonine by excellence. His incompetence and extravagance in matters of finance made it utterly impossible for him to carry out any of the gigantic plans originated by Julius II. His chief merit in the opinion of Dr. Pastor is the tenacity with which he defended Raphael against that immortal artist's rivals and maligners.

One-sixth of the present volume (or about one hundred pages) is occupied with the story of the rise and condemnation of Lutheranism. Although the learned author has little new to say on a subject worn threadbare, what he says is well said, and it would be difficult to find the painful topic treated so well elsewhere. What chiefly distinguishes Dr. Pastor's account from most others is that he views the scene from the standpoint of Rome and gives a clear and consistent narrative of the course and progress of the ecclesiastical trial of the heresiarch. During Leo's reign Lutheranism remained the theological heresy with which it began; it had not yet developed into a political revolution.

We have to admire the judiciousness of the author's perspective. Six hundred pages were quite sufficient for his purpose of presenting a full and impartial statement of the occurrences during a reign of eight years. It is annoying to have to follow the Pontiff in his petty intrigues of Italian politics or on his periodical hunting trips, at a time when so many vast interests were at stake, but the historian's duty is to narrate facts, not create them. Now that the last trace of a French Concordat has disappeared, it is interesting to study once more the details of the first of them, that which was concluded by Leo X. and Francis I. at Bologna. The Pontiff has been fiercely criticized for his generosity in handing over nearly all the rights of the French Church to the crown; but how few reflect that, had he acted otherwise, France might have been lost to the Church as well as England or Germany. In point of character, or lack of character, there was little to choose between Francis I. and Henry VIII. Francis failed to carry out his repeated threats of secession, mainly because, through the terms of the Concordat of Bologna, he was virtually head of the French Church. He could not hope to gain by seceding from the unity of Christendom.

The most notable ecclesiastical event in Leo's Pontificate was the Fifth Lateran Council, convened by Julius II. and brought to a close by Leo in the very opening year of the Lutheran Reformation. Many salutary decrees were enacted, but the sad condition of affairs impeded their effective execution.

Dr. Pastor's closing sentence is severe, but hard to gainsay: "Although in many points the last word concerning the Medici Pope has not yet been spoken, yet in the present state of research we are compelled to admit that his Pontificate, so extravagantly lauded by humanists and poets and illumined by the rays of Raphael's art, through an unlimited devotion to worldly tendencies and to new and dazzling forms of culture, as well as through the subordinate place allotted to spiritual interests, was disastrous to the Papal Chair." This is a severe verdict to pass upon a man whose countenance wore a perennial smile and who was equally loath to inflict or suffer pain.

---

THE LIFE OF COUNT MOORE. Compiled from materials supplied by his family by *Albert Barry, C. S. S. R.* 8vo.+xiii., pp. 301. M. H. Gill & Son, Ltd., Dublin.

"So let your light shine before men, that they may see your good works and glorify your Father who is in heaven." "Woe to that man by whom the scandal cometh."

In these two passages our Divine Lord teaches us the importance and necessity of good example. Hence the zeal of the Church at all times in placing before her children the lives of her saints. And hence the zeal of the world in holding up before men for their imitation the lives of sinners. Not in the guise of sinners—the world is too shrewd for that, but in the disguise of saints. To be convinced of this we need but glance at the novel and play of the day, or cast our eye over the list of popular biographies. The men and women who figure in fiction and the drama at the present time have not only not attained the Christian standard of perfection, but they do not even strive for it; in many instances they ignore it, and sometimes openly sneer at it and attack it.

We have indeed in the field of biography, the lives of statesmen, financiers, manufacturers, discoverers, inventors, but very few lives of Christian gentlemen. How seldom do we read of a man who is successful in business or politics, and who is noted for humility, purity and charity. How rarely do we meet a wealthy man who is poor in spirit and who is filled with the spirit of mortification. We find these virtues in canonized saints and in religious who devote their whole lives to God's service, but they are so rare outside of these two classes that we have ceased to look for them. And yet there are uncanonized saints and unvowed servants of God in the world—men and women who keep before their eyes the texts at the beginning of this notice.

Such a man was Count Moore, whose biography now lies before us. In the preface to the book Archbishop Healy, of Tuam, thus speaks of him:

"In the following pages the reader will find a most interesting and readable record of a noble and strenuous life. Count Arthur Moore was no ordinary man. The main purpose of his life was in all things to seek first the kingdom of God; it inspired all his efforts; it ennobled all his thoughts. Such men are plentifully found in religious brotherhoods, giving their whole lives to the service of God, but they are rarely met with in the world. There the pursuit of wealth, or pleasure, or power, or fame is all engrossing. Their votaries find it often impossible to raise their thoughts to the higher sphere of supernatural life. They live entirely for this world, forgetful of the enduring world beyond the grave, which they seek to ignore as far as possible. Not so Arthur Moore. He lived in the world an earnest laborious life, mixing with men in the Senate, on the platform, in the market place, always seeking the betterment of his tenants, his neighbors, his countrymen, careless of calumnies, heedless of dangers, patient of labor, persistent of purpose. There was no great question touching the spiritual or temporal well-being of his countrymen in which he did not take a keen interest and with helpful energy seek to bring about a better state of things. In all this he never thought of self, but rather spent himself—his time, his thought, his money—for God's glory and the welfare of his fellow men."

After reading these words and the passage which we are about to quote from the introduction, we think that it will be generally admitted that such a light should be made to shine before men that they may imitate it and glorify their Father who is in heaven:

"The pages have been written to illustrate the character and perpetuate the memory of a good man, not to chronicle the vicissitudes of a political career. Count Moore was not what we call a man of the world and did not look on life as a pleasant dream, but ever took for his motto the war-cry of the Crusaders, 'God wills it.' Throwing himself entirely into all social and political movements of his time, his mind was full of high ideals, and he never discussed any question without having regard first to its moral aspect. He fought for the regeneration of his country, and believed that the welfare of mankind does not so much depend on the State or on political progress as on belief in God and in the Gospel of Christianity. He, therefore, devoted himself heart and soul to all causes throughout the Christian world which were bound up with the religious prosperity of the people, and his whole life was a witness to the truth and beauty of religion."

ST. JOHN AND THE CLOSE OF THE APOSTOLIC AGE. By the *Abbe Constant Fouard*, member of the Biblical Commission. Authorized translation. 12mo., pp. 250. Longmans, Green & Co., 91 and 93 Fifth avenue, New York. London and Bombay.

The readers of "The Christ the Son of God" and "The Beginnings of the Church" will look upon this last work from his learned pen with more than usual interest when they are informed that he died on the eve of its appearance. They will first be glad that he was able to accomplish so much for Christ and His Church, and then sad that he was not spared to do more. We hear his voice as from the grave thus explaining his last work:

"Up to this stage in the series on 'The Beginning of the Church' I have confined myself to the purely historical narrative, not dwelling on controverted points. As was said in the first lines of 'The Christ the Son of God,' 'my only wish is to make the Saviour better known and loved.' With this end in view the several studies of the Apostolic Missions followed in natural sequence. The work now before us, born of the same spirit, is intended to furnish the reader with a picture of religious conditions toward the close of the first century, at the period when the Fourth Gospel was composed by Saint John, who had outlived all his brethren in the Apostolate and had attained a very advanced age. Men had even come to believe that death would spare that hallowed head, basing this opinion on a single saying of Jesus which seemed to imply that the dearly beloved disciple was to await the Master's coming here on earth. With charming candor the holy patriarch protested, 'The Lord did not say this; what He did say has no such meaning.' He was greatly exercised lest any one be misled; but who could doubt his word, since he alone was left of 'those who had seen Jesus?'

"This divine memory rested like an aureole over his snow locks and invested his person not merely with a venerableness well-nigh universally acknowledged, but with an authority unquestioned in the Church. Accordingly his name, as formerly the names of the great Apostles Peter and Paul, would seem appropriate to represent the period wherein his closing years were spent, a period over which by his deeds as well as by his writings, he exercised so profound an influence. Of the life of Saint John all we shall see is his great work, or rather it is in this work that we shall study the man himself, for therein he has depicted his whole character, at once ardent and tender-hearted; like the eagle, fitted to soar to the loftiest peaks, whence with undazzled gaze his eyes could contemplate the blinding glare of the heavens; anon, descending from those heights, he wearies his disciples with his ceaseless exhortations to love one another. Though like a veritable 'son of the thunderbolt,' he does at times fulminate against the unfaithful Bishops, yet how much oftener is he inspired

by the love with whose perfume his heart was penetrated as he leaned upon the breast of Jesus!"

---

THE UNSEEN WORLD. An Exposition of Catholic Theology in its Relation to Modern Spiritism. By *Rev. Fr. Alexius M. Lepicier, O. S. M., S. Th. M.*, professor of divinity in the College of Propaganda, Rome; consultor of the Sacred Congregation of Propaganda, of the Bible Commission, etc. 12mo., pp. 284. Benziger Brothers, New York, Cincinnati, Chicago.

There is need of a book like this on a subject so generally interesting and yet so little known. It is a subject which is very old because it dates back indefinitely and appeals to all nations, and yet always new, because its interest rather increases than decreases, and because it is constantly presenting new phases.

It calls attention to the universality of the practice and its continued interest in the following passage:

"The attempt to hold intercourse with the inhabitants of the unseen world is not, as some seem to imagine, a practice peculiar to these modern times. It was resorted to long before the Greeks inquired of Apollo in his temple at Delphi through the mouth of the Pythoness and before the Romans consulted the Sibylline oracles at Cumae and at Tibur. Nor is it a practice confined to civilized and cultivated races. The savage man, too, in his lonely hut on his desert island has at all times been in the habit of evoking the spirits of the other world, whether he believed these spirits to be genii, disposed to favor and benefit mankind, demons bent on working harm or mischief, or the souls of the dead seeking for rest amidst their former haunts and environments. History records how extensively spiritistic practices were carried on during the middle ages, and what severe laws, both civil and ecclesiastical, had to be enacted in order to check what was then held to be a dangerous and harmful superstition.

"It is only in the method which is employed in the evoking of these manifestations and in the circumstances under which they take place that any difference can be said to exist between the practice of ancient times and that of these modern days. There is absolute identity in the aim which underlies them—that aim being the obtaining of answers to various questions, the solution of difficult and perplexing problems and the exhibition of phenomena transcending the known powers of nature.

"There is, however, a difference between them which should not be left unnoticed here. While the phenomena obtained were in times past ascribed to beings of a purely spiritual nature, and in no wise connected with matter, they are now held to be due to the souls

of the dead—to departed human beings at one time inhabiting this earth and, like ourselves, incarnate in material bodies. And this modern belief would seem to find support not only in the oft-repeated assertion of the spirits themselves, but also in the result of experiments recently conducted by renowned and well-known English and foreign scientists.

"The object of this book is to set forth, as clearly and as concisely as possible, what the teachings of Catholic theology is on this difficult subject, and where the pathway of safety may be found, not only for Catholics, but for all believers in historic and dogmatic Christianity. For it is in the historic Christian faith alone that we have the true standard by which the momentous problems presented by modern spiritism can be fairly and adequately judged."

The book is a splendid example of conciseness and clearness. One might expect that such a subject would hardly submit to brief and comprehensive treatment, but the author in this case has accomplished the very difficult task. We believe that the book will be found to be fully satisfying, and we recommend it without any hesitation.

---

BEATI PETRI CANISII, S. J., EPISTULAE ET ACTA. Collegit et Adnotationibus Illustravit. *Otto Braunsberger, S. J.* Volumen Quartum. Herder: Freiburg and St. Louis. Price, $9.50 net.

The fourth volume of Father Braunsberger's edition of the "Letters of B. Peter Canisius" embraces a period of about two years, from January 1, 1563, to the death of Lainez, second general of the Jesuits, in January, 1565. At this time Canisius was in the prime of life and was looked upon as one of the very foremost champions of the Catholic religion. His correspondence includes letters to and from the Supreme Pontiff Pius IV., the Emperor Ferdinand, Duke Albert V. of Bavaria, Cardinals-Legate, Chancellors, and, in fact, nearly every one of prominent station in that generation. The present thick volume of about 1,500 pages contains 449 letters, the less important condensed, and 200 Canisian *monumenta*. Of the letters 340 now see the light for the first time and 140 of the *monumenta*. To obtain this result all the archives of Europe have been ransacked, from the Vatican to the British Museum. When so much has been accomplished in the case of a single personage we can argue how much still remains to be done before the entire material for passing judgment on the Reformation era shall lie before us.

During these two years we find the indefatigable missionary pursuing his accustomed labors as provincial of his order, director of

colleges, assiduous in the pulpit, reëditing his great catechism. But his chief merit at this time was that of holding the Emperor Ferdinand and the other Catholic princes of Germany true to the Catholic cause. Those were the last days of the Council of Trent, and among the faithful laborers to whom we owe the successful termination of the Council Canisius is seen more and more entitled to our gratitude. There is little doubt, as we see through the private letters which passed between him and his general, that had it not been for his influence Ferdinand would have yielded to the suggestions of bad advisers, many of them high ecclesiastics, and would have scattered the assembled Fathers. It was a happy inspiration for the Emperor to summon Canisius to Innsbruck, and it accrues to his honor and renown as a sensible statesman that he preferred the counsels of the great Jesuit to those of less saintly men.

For those who lack the time or patience to wade through the entire mass of letters, acts and sermons, the first forty pages, in which the editor gives a comprehensive digest of the whole, will be found extremely valuable. The typographical setting of the volume is worthy of the subject and of the reputation of Herder.

---

ORGANUM COMITANS AD KYRIALE SEU ORDINARIUM MISSAE. Quod iuxta Editionem Vaticanum harmonice Ornavit. *Dr. Fr. X. Mathias*, Organista Ecclesiae Cathedralis Argentinensis. Neo Eboraci: Sumptibus Friderici Pustet.

The changes required by the Encyclical of the Holy Father on Church Music are so very radical as to call forth numberless questions as to details of practice, and these in turn are creating a literature on the subject which promises to be quite exhaustive. Several of these questions concern the organist and his part in the new order of things. Some of these questions have not been answered yet. For instance, may the organist be a woman? Others are being answered in books like the one before us, which contains the organ accompaniments for the Kyriale or Ordinary of the Mass according to the Vatican edition. The work is done by a well-known competent authority, and is from the Pustet Press, which is a guarantee of accuracy and elegance. The author thus sets forth his purpose and method:

"The chief object of this accompaniment, the fundamental principles of which have been fully set forth in my brochure "Die Choralbegleitung" (Plain Chant Accompaniment), published by the same firm, is to ensure a smooth and flowing method of rendering plain chant. It was therefore of paramount importance that the harmonies should flow naturally as faithful reflections of the flowing

melodies. At the same time care was taken to avoid anything that might tend to render the execution less easy.

"Those who may not like this accompaniment owing to its being *exclusively within the Gregorian scales* are free to make any alterations they may deem proper in passages which to them may sound somewhat crude. The main thing is to preserve the rhythm of the chant. Hence it is desirable that the accompaniment should not be taken in hand until the organist has thoroughly mastered the melody by singing or at least playing it on a stringed instrument, in accordance with the rhythmical form herein exhibited, so that the rhythm may be brought out clearly and distinctly when the chants are rendered with the accompaniment. Only thus can it be well blended with the voices.

"To suit the compass of all voices several numbers, particularly the responses to *Ite missa est* and *Benedicamus Domino,* are given in various transpositions.

"Easy cadences have also been placed at the organist's disposal, with the indication of the recitation note (R) for use when portions of the text are recited only."

---

WHAT CATHOLICS HAVE DONE FOR SCIENCE, with Sketches of the Great Catholic Scientists. By *Rev. Martin S. Brennan, A. M.*, rector of the Church of St. Thomas of Aquin, St. Louis, Mo. Author of "Electricity and its Discoverers," etc. Third Edition. 12mo., pp. 220. Benziger Brothers, New York, Cincinnati, Chicago.

We are glad to be able to record the appearance of the third edition of Father Brennan's brief but effective answer to the trite though persistent calumny that theology and science are contradictory, and that, therefore, the Church is the enemy of science. The philosopher's strongest proofs are facts, for against them no argument can prevail. But here are the facts.

We consider the book so important that we prefer to let the author introduce. Every man knows his own child best:

"The purpose of this little book is, by showing their utter falsity, to refute two widespread notions. One of these notions is that when a man devotes himself to science he must necessarily cease to be a Christian; and the other that the Catholic Church is hostile to scientific progress.

"Nothing, certainly, can be more unjust than the impression that the pursuit of science is prejudicial to a man's piety. A close intimacy with the grand designs of the Creator can only enhance our reverence for His divine beneficence. The more thoroughly we scrutinize the wise and beneficent laws governing the cosmos the

more deeply we will be impressed with the wisdom and goodness of the Almighty Lawgiver. The heart of the true Catholic scientist is instinctively sending up a constant orison to the great White Throne. Gassendi, Picard, Mersenne, De Vico, Piazzi, Boscovich, Leverrier, Tulasne, Hauy, Chevreul and a host of others traveled as far along the path of Christian perfection as along the way of science.

"How the impression that the Church is hostile to science can live among reading people is truly an enigma. The merit of introducing into scientific study the inductive or true system belongs to the children of the Church. Roger Bacon, Albertus Magnus and Leonardo da Vinci, the first great masters of the inductive method, dealt its death-blow to the speculative school of Greece.

"The children of the Church were the pioneers in every branch of science. The greatest names in astronomy, mathematics, mechanics, electricity, galvanism, chemistry, optics, thermotics, mineralogy and botany are Catholic ones. Yes, every branch of modern science owes not only its origin, but the main part of its growth to Catholic scientists, so that it can be said with the sincerest truth that the sceptre of science belongs to the Church."

---

LOURDES: Its Inhabitants, Its Pilgrims and Its Miracles. With an account of the apparitions at the Grotto and a sketch of Bernadette's subsequent history. By *Rev. Richard F. Clark, S. J.* 12mo., pp. 224. Benziger Brothers, New York, Cincinnati and Chicago.

What better recommendation of Father Clark's book on Lourdes can we have than the following letter from the English confessor at the shrine:

"I have read your articles on Lourdes with the most lively interest, and beg you to accept my sincere and most hearty congratulations. *What struck me above all is the rigorous exactitude that prevails throughout your story.* You have succeeded in catching the true spirit of the place. Yours is not a description, it is rather a photograph of persons, places and things.

"I do not say anything of the masterly way in which you have treated the question of miracles. *But I have great pleasure in bearing witness to the correctness of all you narrate.* As I have been a member of the Bureau des Constations for several years, I have myself seen and spoken with all the persons whose cures you recount.

"I hope you will publish your articles together in a little book. It will be very useful to English-speaking visitors, and will be the harbinger of the devotion to Our Lady of Lourdes throughout the United States of America and the widespread lands of the British Empire.

"Father Superior desires me to express to you the sincere gratitude of the whole community, and to assure you that we will not forget to pray for you to Notre Dame de Lourdes."

And the author himself so beautifully sketches Lourdes in his preface, and shows its importance and charm, that a reviewer would be rash indeed who should attempt to do more than quote it:

"There are very few Americans who cross the Atlantic without paying a visit to France's beauteous capital. The strange admixture of virtue and vice, piety and irreligion which they encounter there gives them no true idea of the real state of religion in Catholic France. A large city is generally more prone to evil than less populous districts, and, moreover, in a large city vice seems to come to the surface and virtue to hide itself away in nooks and corners where it escapes the stranger's eye. The American or English tourist who goes no further is in danger of leaving Paris with a false or at least a one-sided view of the religious condition of the country.

"To any one who desires to see the true Catholic faith of France, I would strongly recommend a visit to Lourdes. It is without exception the most marvelous of shrines and places of pilgrimage that the world has witnessed in modern times.

"Lourdes is very easy of access from the French capital. It is a journey of some eighteen or twenty hours. The evening express from Paris will bring the traveler to the Grotto by the following afternoon. Nor will he be disappointed on his arrival there. Lourdes presents even to the casual visitor a sight unparalleled elsewhere. He will see countless crowds of pious pilgrims gathering around the Grotto with a strong and firm faith in the miraculous power to heal of the water that flows there. He will see the assemblage from every part of France and the neighboring countries, of thousands and tens of thousands who come to ask for some favor from the Mother of God, by reason of her there having manifested herself to a poor peasant girl. He will see the halt and the lame, the blind and the deaf, the victims of almost every incurable disease that afflicts humanity, brought thither that they may be healed. And what is far more wonderful, he will see not a few of these depart in health and strength, cured of those ills that the skilled physician pronounced absolutely incurable. He will see, moreover, thousands of sons and daughters of Catholic France joining in solemn procession to pray for blessings on their country and to intercede for those who have lost their faith. He will hear them shouting out in sonorous refrain the hymns of Catholic devotion and the heartfelt expressions of Catholic loyalty. Above all these he will see undeniable marks of an earnestness, a sincerity, a strong simplicity of faith, a deeply rooted attachment to religion which

declares France to be still sound at heart, in spite of the vice of her large towns and the Godlessness of so many, even those who still call themselves by the name of Catholics.

"To all Lourdes must have an intense interest, whether Catholic or non-Catholic, believer or skeptic. But above all to the faithful children of the Church it has an attraction which is something beyond the natural desire to satisfy religious curiosity. No Catholic who has studied carefully and thoroughly the record of the miracles wrought at Lourdes, and the account of the apparitions of Our Lady to Bernadette Soubirous, can fail to be convinced of the reality both of one and of the other. Such a conviction will carry with it a strong desire to see the spot where these wonders are wrought, to drink of the health-giving fount, to pray at the shrine where God has thus manifested His power and His love. Even those who have not this conviction will be drawn to Lourdes by a desire to study more closely a phenomenon so remarkable, and to form a judgment from their own personal experience of the causes that have given rise to it.

"This little book is written with the hope that it may induce many Americans, and especially many American Catholics, to visit Lourdes and investigate its wonders for themselves. The reader can rely on the accuracy of the facts narrated, since they have been submitted to the good fathers in charge of the Grotto, who have had the kindness to correct these pages. The courtesy which the writer himself met with at their hands will be experienced by every visitor. Several of the fathers are perfectly conversant with English. One of them has been for many years in America. Another has spent some time in England. All of them are ready to afford every facility to the visitor of thoroughly investigating for himself all the wonders that are wrought in Lourdes.

"In the various hotels excellent accommodation may be had, and the country around is marked by a picturesque beauty closely resembling that of certain portions of the Bernesse Oberland. Lourdes is an excellent centre for excursions into the heart of the Pyrenees, and only a few hours are required to reach the Spanish frontier. Any one traveling from France to Spain will necessarily pass within a short distance of Lourdes and find it a most convenient halting place."

---

ST. FRANCIS OF ASSISI, SOCIAL REFORMER. By *Leo L. Dubois, S. M.* 12mo., pp. 250. Benziger Brothers, New York, Cincinnati and Chicago.

To one who has observed the frequency with which St. Francis of Assisi has been chosen by authors of both sexes and various beliefs

as the subject of their pens, it must seem surprising that another life should be announced, and still more surprising that it should be written from a new point of view. Yet such is the case. We have before us for the first time St. Francis of Assisi, the Social Reformer. The author makes his declaration in this way:

"The bibliograph of St. Francis reveals to us two facts equally striking: the wonderful abundance of literature on the saint and his work, and, at the same time, the absence of any study professedly treating St. Francis as a social reformer. In the following pages an attempt is made to present him in this light. Hence the sociological point of view is taken throughout. An effort is made to describe the steps by which he became a reformer, the work accomplished by him, the processes of his mind and the traits of his character as far as these affected his reform work, the social ideas and principles on which his reform work was grounded.

"The following conclusions seem to be justified by the facts brought to our knowledge by a study of the documents of St. Francis' time:

"Francis, born in an age of faith, feeling and enthusiasm, but also of social unrest, became a reformer as the natural outcome of his love for God and for everything which God has created. A strenuous saint, but none the less open to the tenderest human sentiments, a poet, a troubadour, a chevalier in character and aspirations, intensely in love with a poor, abandoned, but chaste maiden, 'La donna Poverta,' Francis felt that he had received from God a mission to convert the world and restore the peace and happiness which ought to reign among His children. He went to the people, to the poor and the rich, to the laymen and the clergy, to the great and the lowly, captivating all not only by his charming character, but also by his unstudied and unaffected, yet irresistible eloquence; thus he became the soul of a popular movement which spread all over Europe and made itself felt in all parts of the then known world.

"There was no philosophy, no method, no spirit of organization in Francis, nor were they necessary for the creation of a popular movement. When the preservation of Francis' work required thought, order, direction, he himself applied to the Church that 'like a loving mother' she might supply what was lacking in the child and bring his work to completion and success.

"Though the reform which Francis and the Church accomplished conjointly was above all religious, based on the Gospel and aimed at the conversion and salvation of man, it was nevertheless all comprehensive, including the natural as well as the supernatural, the material as well as the spiritual in man. It aimed not at the destruction of existing principles and institutions, but at the repression of abuses

committed by individuals and the triumph of charity and justice among men."

After an introduction which is excellently done and which gives a general view of affairs just prior to the coming of St. Francis and at the time of his arrival on the scene, the book is divided into three parts, which treat respectively of "The History of St. Francis," "His Character" and "His Ideas on Social Reform." In a conclusion occupying ten pages the reader is admirably helped to permanent results from his labors, and then he finds before him a full bibliography which will help him to pursue the subject further if he will. Altogether the book is very charming, being well written and avoiding the faults which one finds in books of the kind which are either too short or too long.

---

THE THRONE OF THE FISHERMAN: The Root, the Bond and the Crown of Christendom. Being Vol. V. of "The Formation of Christendom," by *Thomas W. Allies, K. C. S. G.*, author of a "Life's Decision," "Per Crucem ad Lucem," "Journal in France and Letters From Italy." New edition. 12mo., pp. 483. Burns & Oates, Ltd., London. Benziger Brothers, New York, Cincinnati and Chicago. 1906.

The appearance of Volume V. of "The Formation of Christendom" furnishes an apt occasion for saying a word again in favor of this splendid historical work. Every one who knows it must speak enthusiastically of it and must desire to bring it to the notice of his neighbor. It is sad that good books like good persons are soon forgotten except by a very few scholars who hold them more dear than the miser holds his gold. We need sadly a Catholic magazine of bibliography, or departments of bibliography in our already existing magazines. They should publish lists of books, with reviews and descriptions, on every phase of Catholicity and kindred subjects, and they should republish the same matter from time to time, because new classes of readers and students are formed very frequently. The necessity of repeating information of this kind cannot be dwelt upon too strongly. Inquiries are constantly being made for the best books on Catholic subjects, and they are hard to answer.

Here is a fine opportunity for Catholic Truth Societies. We feel that we cannot help our readers to know the book before us better than by reproducing Cardinal Vaughan's letter on it:

"Very Rev. Dear ———: Mr. Allies has just republished in a cheap and popular edition his volume entitled 'The Formation of Christendom.' It is one of the noblest historical works I have ever read. Now that its price has placed it within the reach of all, I earnestly pray that it may become widely known and appreciatively studied. We have nothing like it in the English language. It meets a need which becomes greater daily with the increase of mental

culture and the spread of education. No English work that I know exhibits the mission of the Church to the world, to the pagan world, to the civilized world, and I might add to the modern world (which is both pagan and civilized in marked degrees), in a more eloquent, a more fascinating or more convincing manner. If any man desires to ennoble his own estimate of the Catholic Church, let him read this book. If any man's soul is capable of rising to a lofty ideal of life, let him understand the part that Christ has taken (and is still taking) in the formation of Christendom, as is shown from trustworthy sources by the pen of Mr. Allies.

"If you desire to enlarge the mind of the youth committed to your care, to inspire noble thoughts, to kindle generous resolves, to lift up churchmen to the level of their Church, you cannot do better than commend a serious perusal of this volume. I used to urge, even while none but the expensive first edition was accessible, that it ought to be made a text-book for every ecclesiastical student, whether destined for home or foreign missions, for a religious house or for the world. I rejoice, therefore, that at least the difficulty of price has been removed.

"I strongly recommend you to press the perusal of this book upon your ecclesiastical students, and not only upon them, but as you have opportunity upon the attention of laymen and women also. In proportion as they take a serious view of life they will become braced and encouraged by this noble portraiture of the Church's life and action in the world, on the individual, on society and on philosophy.

"I am persuaded that nothing wiser could be done than to place this book in the hands of many educated men and women who are inquiring into the claims of the Church and are searching for an answer to the problems which stand out before their consciences. They need not controversy, but the light of history to illumine their souls. They will find it here. Wishing you every blessing, believe me, Very Rev. ———, your faithful and devoted servant,

"Herbert Cardinal Vaughan."

---

Thoughts and Affections of the Passion of Jesus Christ. For every day of the year. Taken from Holy Scripture and the writings of the Fathers of the Church. By *Fra Gaetano M. da Bergamo, Capuchin.* Translated from the Italian. 8vo., pp. 527. Benziger Brothers, New York, Cincinnati and Chicago.

The question is often asked when a new book on an old subject appears, what excuse can be offered for its appearance? It must be admitted that very often there is good reason for this question. Scholars generally agree that fewer books on important subjects are preferable to many, because concentration is a very necessary quality for the acquisition of knowledge, and the student who flits

from author to author, as the bee from flower to flower, may gather some sweetness and pleasure, but he will hardly acquire solid knowledge.

There is one subject, however, which is so inexhaustible and which furnishes such varied food for thought that it is never tiresome or unprofitable, and a new presentation is always welcome. Indeed, we may say that all knowledge is concentrated in this one subject, Jesus Christ crucified. For this reason a new book on the Passion of our Divine Lord is always welcome, but doubly so when it possesses such abundant merit as the one before us. We should add, however, that the book is not new in the strict sense of the word, but it is new to the present generation, and it is a recent translation of a valuable work in Italian, which had been almost forgotten because it was out of print for many years.

The author thus speaks of his plan:

"In this little work I have drawn out the reflections on the Passion of Jesus Christ for every day of the year, but I could find no title properly to express its character and object. At last I decided to use the word 'Thoughts and Affections,' which to me appear the most appropriate. I had a reason for not wishing to call it a book of meditations—namely, that it might the more readily be perused by certain persons who imagine that thinking is common to all, but that meditations belong only to a few, and who on this supposition throw aside as unfit for them any spiritual book offered under the name of meditations.

"There is no doubt that meditation, if rightly understood, means something more than thinking; for we say of our mind that it thinks even when it wanders and is distracted and apprehends objects present to it but superficially. Whilst it cannot be said to meditate, unless with mature deliberation it ruminates and penetrates things, so as to arrive, under the guidance of reason, at a knowledge of some truth. Nevertheless, though these thoughts are, in fact, real meditations, I do not call them by that name because meditation always requires labor and study; whereas, if any one desires to make use of this work, he will not be obliged to draw for himself from the holy mysteries contemplated the practical truths by which he should regulate his life, since he will find in it, well prepared, what his understanding would be forced to do by means of considerations, reflections and reasoning."

---

JURISPRUDENTIA ECCLESIASTICA AD USUM ET COMMODITATEM UTRIUSQUE CLERI. Auctore *P. Petro Mocchegiani, O. F. M.* Complete in three volumes. Herder: Freiburg and St. Louis. Price of the three volumes, $6.50 net.

We learn with regret that the learned author of this valuable work

ended his laborious and much afflicted career at Camerino on the 14th of September of last year, while the last volume was passing through the press. In his death not only the Franciscan Order, but the entire Church has experienced a great loss. Owing to the frail condition of his health, Father Mocchegiani was incapacitated from taking a prominent share in public affairs; hence his name is unknown to the general public. All the more is it venerated by those who were acquainted with the brilliant gifts with which God had endowed him. He held for a time the important position of Definitor General of his order, was frequently employed on business of the highest moment and will ever be remembered by his brethren for his valuable services in the affair of the reunion of the Order of Friars Minor. His opinion was often sought by the Roman Congregations. He was Consultor of the Congregation of Indulgences and wrote a standard work on Sacred Indulgences. Shortly before his death he was appointed by the Holy Father to membership in the special commission for the revision and codification of the laws of the Universal Church.

It is obvious that a treatise on ecclesiastical jurisdiction by so able and experienced an author must possess an extraordinary value and authority. The value of the work is enhanced by the fact that it is not a new text-book on canon law. It is rather a compilation of essays on the several topics treated of in the ordinary text-books, so arranged that any one who seeks information on any particular point can satisfy himself without being referred to different sections of the work. It had been the author's intention to complete his work in two volumes, but a third volume was called for by recent legislation of various kinds. It is in every respect an up-to-date publication and one which without doubt will be regarded as a classic in its line.

---

THE WESTMINSTER LIBRARY. A series of manuals for Catholic priests and students. Edited by the Right Rev. Mgr. Bernard Ward, president of St. Edmund's College, and the Rev. Herbert Thurston, S. J.

THE TRADITION OF SCRIPTURE: Its Origin, Authority and Interpretation. By *Rev. William Barry, D. D.*, sometime scholar of the English College, Rome; former professor of theology in St. Mary's College, Oscott; author of "The Papal Monarchy," etc. 12mo., pp. xxv.+278. Longmans, Green & Co., New York, London and Bombay.

"This series of hand-books is designed to meet a need which the editors believe has been widely felt, and which results in a great measure from the predominant importance attached to dogmatic and moral theology in the studies preliminary to the priesthood. That the first place must of necessity be given to these subjects will not be disputed. But there remains a large outlying field of pro-

fessional knowledge which is always in danger of being crowded out in the years before ordination and the practical utility of which may not be fully realized until some experience of the ministry has been gained. It will be the aim of the present series to offer the sort of help which is dictated by such experience, and its development will be largely guided by the suggestions past and future of the clergy themselves. To provide text-books for dogmatic treatises is not contemplated—at any rate not at the outset. On the other hand, the pastoral work of the missionary priest will be kept constantly in view, and the series will also deal with those historical and liturgical aspects of Catholic belief and practice which are every day being brought more into prominence."

Basing our judgment on this announcement, we should say that the publication of this series is a step in the right direction. Every ecclesiastical student and every thoughtful, inquiring layman has felt the need which this series is intended to supply, and has often been forced to continue his studies in an imperfect manner because the proper books in convenient form were not accessible. If this new series remedies the evil, it ought to have a prompt and kind reception. The names of the editors are the best guarantee that it will, and Dr. Barry's name on the title page of the present number of the series is certainly a good omen. His clearness, accuracy and elegance in writing lend a special value to his name that begets confidence *a priori*. Nor is this confidence misplaced in the present instance. This book, though necessarily containing much matter in limited space, does not therefore become obscure or tiresome. On the contrary, it is interesting and informing throughout. It must have cost the author a great deal of labor.

---

LEX LEVITARUM, OR PREPARATION FOR THE CURE OF SOULS. By the *Right Rev. John Cuthbert Hedley, O. S. B., Bishop of Newport.* With the Regula Pastoralis of St. Gregory the Great. 12mo., pp. lvi.+348. Benziger Brothers, New York, Cincinnati, Chicago. MCMV.

Everything from the hand of Bishop Hedley is sure to be interesting and instructive. He is not only a master himself, but he recognizes a Master. His zeal for the salvation of souls is equaled by his zeal for the instruction and training of those to whom the care of souls is committed. Hence the present work, which the right reverend author thus describes:

" 'The Regula Pastoralis of St. Gregory the Great' is not a book that is out of date. But, like most writings of a long by-gone age, it invites a commentary. I should like Bishops, pastors and Church students to be familiar with its text. But what I have tried to do

in the following pages is to pick out one or two of the holy Pope's more profound and fertile views and principles and to work them out in some detail for the benefit of Church students. What is required in the training of priests is to combine the wisdom of the fathers with the clear perception of present day needs. No instruction or exhortation addressed to candidates for the sacred ministry will be sure and safe if it is not grounded upon Catholic tradition. It is not safe to venture on nevel views, smart criticism and modern appreciations of priestly life without keeping the eye upon that interpretation of the Gospel spirit which is presented to us in the writings of the great fathers of the Church. And among the fathers there is none who holds so high a place of authority in regard to the duty of the care of souls as St. Gregory the Great. Leaving on one side the adequate consideration of the pastoral charge itself, I confine myself to the preparation for that charge so far as it affects the advanced students in our seminaries."

---

LIFE OF SIR JOHN T. GILBERT, LL. D., F. S. A., Irish Historian and Archivist, Vice President of the Royal Irish Academy, Secretary of the Public Record Office of Ireland. By his wife, *Rosa Mulholland Gilbert.* With portraits and illustrations. 8vo., pp. 461. Longmans, Green & Co., New York and Bombay.

"John T. Gilbert was the son of an English Protestant father and an Irish Catholic mother who were married in Dublin in 1821. The father was of an old and honorable family of Devonshire, the same which gave to the world Sir Humphry Gilbert and Sir John Gilbert, and their step-brother, Sir Walter Raleigh, each of whom received knighthood for his services to Queen Elizabeth. The great-great-grandfather of John T. Gilbert was Edward Gilbert of Ipplepen, whose son was Edward Gilbert of Little Hempstone, who died in the year of 1797.

"The work done by Sir John T. Gilbert was little known to or understood by the ordinary reading public; his manner of pursuing that work was unobtrusive, while the amount and the results of it were very great. To give an outline of his career, an indication of his achievements and at the same time to suggest some idea of his unusual and many-sided personality has been recognized as a difficult undertaking.

"His life-long labors in and for his country were begun in boyhood and carried on too much and too often against wind and tide; yet his rare qualities of heart as well as mind secured him lasting friendships not only among sympathizers, but among opponents. So little was he concerned about future estimates of himself that he left few ordered notes to simplify the task of a biographer. For-

tunately the archivist's habit of withholding from destruction current papers and letters which might possibly include some item of value for his work preserved records which have enabled me to attempt to produce a memoir which I trust will in some degree satisfy his friends and interest a certain public."

---

REX MEUS. By the author of "My Queen and My Mother." With preface by the Right Rev. Bishop Hanlon. 12mo., pp. 183. Benziger Brothers, New York, Cincinnati, Chicago.

"The author of this devout and interesting little book is already well known through former writings to a large circle of readers. The present book is a meditative work touching some of the clearly marked periods of the career of holy David; of the kind and good shepherd who was anointed King and became Israel's greatest ruler; the most distinguished of patriarchs, the best known of the prophets, the sweet singer of Israel and the man after God's own heart. There is no saint of the older Scriptures whose character has been so clearly and so fully given to us as that of King David. His own writings are among the best and most used of the older inspired books.

"The following pages make no pretence to be an exhaustive exposition of this great subject; the facts have been fully given in the language of Scripture from the first and second books of Kings, and striking analogies between the events of the life of holy David and events in the life of Our Lord have been sufficiently indicated to be instructive. The perusal of these resemblances and foreshadowings of what was to come in the life of Our Blessed Redeemer and of those who in their measure were to be made lige unto Him is so interesting and so edifying that the minds of many will naturally be led on to good reflections and fruitful thoughts."

---

MARY THE QUEEN. A Life of the Blessed Mother for Her Little Ones. By a Religious of the Society of the Holy Child Jesus. 12mo., pp. 172. Illustrated. New York: Benziger Brothers.

Most children's books fall short of the mark or shoot over it. Most speakers and writers imagine before they try that they can speak or write for children. It seems very easy. The step from childhood to manhood is so short, and we remain children in so many ways, that we are tempted to think we understand the child's capacity fully. But experience shows that we don't, with few exceptions. Perhaps, too, vanity has something to do with our failures. Consciously or unconsciously, it may be that although we start out with the firm determination of addressing the child only,

when we see the man or woman before us we address him or her. Whatever be the reason, the fact is that most children's books on serious subjects are failures. It is especially gratifying to note an exception in the little book before us. The writer does understand the child capacity, and she gives the child just as much intellectual food as it can digest, rightly cooked and invitingly served.

The book will be most effective in the hands of the parent or teacher because it deals with the best of all human models.

---

IL LIBRO D'ORO. Of those whose names are written in the Lamb's book of life. Translated from the Italian by *Mrs. Francis Alexander.* 12mo., cloth, pp. 500. Price, $2.00 net; postpaid, $2.18. Little, Brown & Co., 254 Washington street, Boston.

Lucia Alexander, the mother of Francesca Alexander, whose "Story of Ida" and collection of Italian legends, published under the title of "The Hidden Servants," are so widely known, has in this remarkable volume given to the English-speaking world a priceless collection of more than one hundred and twenty miracle stories and sacred legends, written by fathers of the Church and published in Italy in the sixteenth, seventeenth and eighteenth centuries. The collection is derived from four books: 1. "Selections from the Lives of the Holy Fathers, together with the Spiritual Field," Venice, 1623. 2. "Selections from the Lives of the Saints and Beati of Tuscany," Florence, 1627. 3. "Selections from the Wonders of God in His Saints," Bologna, 1593. 4. "Flowers of Sanctity," Venice, 1726. The stories are rich in sacred history and legend, and many of them have a deeply religious significance which will appeal to all spiritually minded people.

---

MEDITATIONS ON THE MYSTERIES OF FAITH AND THE EPISTLES AND GOSPELS FOR EACH DAY AND THE PRINCIPAL FEASTS OF THE YEAR. By a Monk of Sept-Fonts. Translated from the French by the religious of the Visitation, Wilmington, Del. Revised and edited by Rev. Ferreol Girardey, C. SS. R. In two volumes. St. Louis: B. Herder. Price, $4.00 net for both volumes.

The translation of these pious meditations of the anonymous monk of Sept-Fonts was a labor of love to the daughters of St. Francis de Sales. They are certainly masterly in their simplicity and equally adapted to the spiritual needs of religious men and women and to make excellent reading for those who wish to make progress in the way of salvation. They adhere to the Epistles and Gospels of the ecclesiastical year, and will be a fruitful source of thought to many a hard-worked missionary in the preparation of his Sunday homilies. The translation has been extremely well done. There is absolutely no indication, outside the title page, that the meditations were originally written in another language.